FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-92-043
Wednesday
4 March 1992

Daily Report
Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-92-043 CONTENTS *4 March 1992*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Arbatov Argues Against Joint SDI Program *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 4 Mar]* 1
  'Control System' Safeguards Viewed *[NEW TIMES Jan]* 2
Case for Joint Space Defenses Rebutted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Feb]* 6
'New Defense Logic' Needs Consideration *[NOVOYE VREMYA Feb]* 10
General Replies to Anti-Missile Treaty Critics *[Moscow International]* 11
Strains Among Nuclear Countries Threaten CIS *[KURANTY 4 Mar]* 12
World Center for Nuclear Scientists Urged *[Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU 28 Feb]* . 12
Investigation Continues Into Uranium Sales *[Moscow TV]* 14
Strategic Bombers Taken Out of Production *[IZVESTIYA 25 Feb]* 14
Journalists Visit World's Biggest Nuclear Sub *[IZVESTIYA 28 Feb]* 15
Dumped Chemical Weapons, Contamination Viewed *[TASS]* 15
Reports on Nuclear Waste Burial 'Refuted' *[Moscow TV]* 16
Secrecy on Warsaw Pact Nuclear War Plans Hit *[KURANTY 7 Feb]* 16

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Samsonov on Main Results of PRC Visit *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Mar]* 17
Army Chief Signs Plan on DPRK Army Ties *[Radio Rossii]* 17
  Meets Kim Il-song *[TASS]* 17
  More on DPRK Visit *[Moscow Radio]* 17
Further Incidents With U.S. Navy Forseen *[Moscow International]* 18
Marshal Meets North Atlantic Assembly Group *[TASS]* 18
Shaposhnikov To Visit Turkey, France *[TASS]* 18
Woerner, Velayati Trips to CIS Pondered *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Feb]* 18
Pentagon Resistance to Military Cuts Reported *[PRAVDA 3 Mar]* 20
U.S. Aid Viewed; Large-Scale Thefts Denied *[IZVESTIYA 28 Feb]* 20

INTERREGIONAL AFFAIRS

Commonwealth

'Struggle' To Convene Congress Continues 22
  Umalatova States Case *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 3 Mar]* 22
  Congress To Be Legally Powerless *[TASS]* 23
  Could Lead to 'War of Governments' *[INTERFAX]* 23
  Need for 'New Center' Discussed *[INTERFAX]* 23
Agenda Set for Heads of Government Meeting *[TASS]* 24

Military

Withdrawal From Baltics 'Complex and Difficult' *[Radio Rossii]* 24
Fate of Air Defense Forces Considered *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Mar]* 26
Aviation Pilots on Social Protection Issues *[Moscow TV]* 26
Servicemen Criticize Armed Forces Leadership *[INTERFAX]* 27
Military Property To Be Defended 'By Force' *[BALTFAX]* 27

Media

CIS-Wide Broadcasting Company Proposed *[Radio Rossii]* 27
Papers' Financial Situation Remains 'Uncertain' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 3 Mar]* 27
TASS Carries Press Review for 4 Mar 28

RUSSIA

International Affairs

Bush Cited on Yeltsin's Jun Washington Visit *[TASS]* 29
Kozyrev, Baker Hold Telephone Conversation *[Radio Rossii]* 29
Intelligence Service To Cut Network in U.S. *[INTERFAX]* 29
U.S. Official on Long Term Aid Programs *[TASS]* 29
Tatarstan Vice President Ends U.S. Visit *[INTERFAX]* 29
  Satisfied With Visit *[INTERFAX]* 30
Kozyrev Interviewed on Foreign Policy Issues *[Russian TV]* 30
Churkin Gives Briefing on International Policy *[TASS]* 35
Yeltsin-Nakasone Talks, Peace Treaty Viewed *[Moscow International]* 36
Tokyo Sees No Progress on Territorial Issue *[TASS]* 36
Honecker Returns to Chilean Embassy in Moscow *[INTERFAX]* 37
Trade Agreement Reached With Estonia *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 3 Mar]* 37
Progress of Talks With IMF Assessed *[KURANTY 3 Mar]* 38
  Areas of Attention Noted *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 2 Mar]* 38

Federation Affairs

Government Leaders Meet With People's Deputies 39
  Burbulis, Gaydar Cited *[TASS]* 39
  Gaydar on Production, Payments 'Crisis' *[Moscow Radio]* 39
  Gaydar on Free Prices *[INTERFAX]* 40
New Vice Premiers' Duties Not 'Petty Tutelage' *[IZVESTIYA 4 Mar]* 40
Yeltsin Appoints Shakray Airspace Control Head *[Moscow Radio]* 40
Present Government 'Could Be Forced To Resign' *[Copenhagen DET FRI AKTUELT 2 Mar]* 40
Interior Minister Reports Increase in Crime *[INTERFAX]* 41
  Presents Crime Statistics *[Moscow Radio]* 42
Draft of New Criminal Code Criticized *[TASS]* 42
Conference Notes Local Resistance to Reform *[KURANTY 3 Mar]* 42
Russian Citizenship Law Effective as of 3 Mar *[Moscow Radio]* 42
Commentator on Russian Draft Federal Treaty *[Moscow International]* 43
Arms Exports Earnings Would Ease Conversion *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 28 Feb]* 43
PRAVDA Distribution Problems Noted *[PRAVDA 3 Mar]* 46
Yeltsin Decree's Impact on Paper Sales Weighed *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 3 Mar]* 47
State Employees Receive 45% Pay Increase *[Moscow TV]* 47
Decree Establishes Entrepreneurship Council *[INTERFAX]* 47
Deputy Finance Minister Discusses Taxation *[TASS]* 47
Russian Taxation Service Chief Briefs Press *[IZVESTIYA 27 Feb]* 48
Review of Economic Reform Program *[INTERFAX]* 48
Official Outlines Measures To Strengthen Ruble *[IZVESTIYA 28 Feb]* 50
Compensating Depositors To Cost R92 Billion *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Mar]* 51
Railroad Union Vows Worker Benefit Protection *[INTERFAX]* 51
Workers Movement Calls For Popular Assembly *[INTERFAX]* 52
'Moscow Tribune' Fears Communist Influences *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 3 Mar]* 52
Democratic Leaders 'Second-Rate Politicians' *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 3 Mar]* 52

Supreme Soviet

Parliament Discusses Foreign Policy Tasks *[TASS]* 53
Deputies Sign Appeal on Tatarstan Referendum *[INTERFAX]* 53
Tatar Parliament Head Meets Russian Deputies *[Russian TV]* 53
Draft Laws on Chechen-Ingushetia Discussed *[POSTFACTUM]* 53
Parliament To Hold Defense Policy Session *[INTERFAX]* 54
Khasbulatov Accused of Human Rights Violations *[POSTFACTUM]* 54
Decision on Sakhalin Fuel Rights Set for 9 Mar *[INTERFAX]* 55

Regional Affairs

Moscow Government Bans 17 Mar Rally *[INTERFAX]* ... 55
  Deputy Mayor Cited *[TASS]* ... 55
Moscow Government Develops Privatization Plan *[INTERFAX]* ... 55
Muscovites View Government Aid as Inadequate *[IZVESTIYA 3 Mar]* ... 56
St. Petersburg Launches Privatization Program *[TASS]* ... 57
St. Petersburg City, Oblast in Land Dispute *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 26 Feb]* ... 57
Dudayev Cites Caucasus Unification Conditions *[Moscow Radio]* ... 58
Chechen Military Groups Based on Clans *[Russian TV]* ... 58
Kuzbass, Moscow Establish Direct Economic Ties *[Moscow Radio]* ... 58
Kuzbass Gold Association To Act Independently *[POSTFACTUM]* ... 58
Vorkuta Miners Threaten To Start Patrols *[Moscow TV]* ... 58
Rostov Communists Demand Government Resignation *[POSTFACTUM]* ... 58
Dagestan Endorses Law on Right To Bear Arms *[POSTFACTUM]* ... 59
Bread Coupon Experiment in Kemerovo Abolished *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 2 Mar]* ... 59

UKRAINE

International Affairs

Price Rise Forces Closure of Gas Pipeline *[Moscow TV]* ... 60
  Fokin Appeals to Turkmenistan *[Moscow TV]* ... 60
Russian Intentions Toward Fleet Criticized *[INTERFAX]* ... 60
Latvia's Share of USSR Foreign Debt Pledged *[TASS]* ... 61
Morozov on Agreements With Hungarian Military *[TASS]* ... 61
German Resettlement Matter of 'Justice' *[IZVESTIYA 2 Mar]* ... 61

National Affairs

Reportage on Rukh Decisions, Internal Divisions ... 62
  Wants Crimean Parliament Disbanded *[Moscow TV]* ... 62
  Leaders Hold News Conference *[Kiev Radio]* ... 62
  Split Avoided *[IZVESTIYA 3 Mar]* ... 63
  'Struggle' Seen in Compromise *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 3 Mar]* ... 63
Parliament Considers Crimean Events, Referendum *[Moscow Radio]* ... 64
Odessa To Have Foreign Ministry Mission *[Kiev Radio]* ... 65
Kravchuk Creates National Space Agency *[TASS]* ... 65
Party Criticizes 'Extremist' Groups *[Kiev Radio]* ... 65
Officers in Far East Request Transfers Home *[Russian TV]* ... 65
Dnepropetrovsk Chief Resigns Over Miner Strike *[Moscow Radio]* ... 65
Dnepropetrovsk Regional Soviet Criticized *[Kiev Radio]* ... 65
Trade Agreements Signed With Tyumen Oblast *[Radio Rossii]* ... 66
Conversion of Military Industry Fund Approved *[Kiev Radio]* ... 66
Minister of Cabinet of Ministers Appointed *[Kiev Radio]* ... 66
Entry Visas Available Upon Arrival in Ukraine *[TASS]* ... 66

WESTERN REGION

Moldova

Further Reportage on Disturbance in Dubossary ... 67
  Cossacks Defend Involvement *[IZVESTIYA 2 Mar]* ... 67
  INTERFAX Reviews Developments ... 67
  Chisinau Citizens Demonstrate *[Radio Rossii]* ... 67
  Militia Gathers Near Kochiery *[Moscow Radio]* ... 67
  Snegur: Resolution To Be Peaceful *[Moscow TV]* ... 68
  Attacks on CIS Troops Viewed *[TASS]* ... 68
  Security Minister Addresses Parliament *[Bucharest Radio]* ... 68
  Clashes Part of Dnestr 'Coup' *[TASS]* ... 69
  Cossacks Arrive in Tiraspol *[Radio Rossii]* ... 69

Dnestr Forces Have Grad Launcher *[TASS]* 69
Snegur Trying To Deal With Problem *[INTERFAX]* 70
Interior Ministry Issues Communique *[Bucharest Radio]* 70

CENTRAL ASIA

Kyrgyzstan

Turkish Delegation Arrives for Official Visit *[TASS]* 72
Cooperation Protocols Signed *[Ankara ANATOLIA]* 72
'Ottoman Turks' Promised Help *[Ankara TV]* 72
New Defense Chief Notes Ownership of Weapons *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Feb]* 72
Vice President Speaks on Aircraft Transfer *[Moscow TV]* 73
Freeze on Constitutional Court Law Suggested *[INTERFAX]* 73

Turkmenistan

Halt of Gas Supplies to Ukraine Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 3 Mar]* 73
Diplomatic Relations Planned With U.S. *[POSTFACTUM]* 74

CAUCASUS

Azerbaijan

Helicopters Evacuate Part of 366th Regiment *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Mar]* 75
Rocket Attack on Evacuation Helicopter Kills 6 *[TASS]* 75
National Council Appeals to Foreign Parliaments *[Baku Radio]* 75
Statement Issued on Khodzhaly Operation *[Yerevan Radio]* 76
Armenian Helicopters Said Flying Arms to Region *[TASS]* 76
Arms Shipments Unconfirmed *[TASS]* 76
Extraordinary Supreme Soviet Meeting Scheduled *[Baku Radio]* 76
Situation in Rayons, Armenian Attacks Reported *[Baku Radio]* 76
Agdam 'Remains Tense'; Crimes Reported *[Baku Radio]* 77
Appeal Sent to Yeltsin on Khodzhaly 'Massacre' *[Baku Radio]* 77
Organizations Protest Armenian 'Terrorism' *[Baku Radio]* 77
Commander of Military in Nagorno-Karabakh Named *[POSTFACTUM]* 78
Bid for President's Resignation Prompts Rally *[INTERFAX]* 78

Georgia

Gamsakhurdia Supporters Picket, Stage 'Pogrom' *[Moscow Radio]* 78
Council Official Confers With Shevardnadze *[INTERFAX]* 78
No Clashes in South Ossetia in Past 24 Hours *[TASS]* 78
Highlanders Demand Solution *[TASS]* 79
Russian Commander Discusses Security Role *[SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA 27 Feb]* 79
Accusations Against Gamsakhurdia Detailed *[DRONI 22 Feb]* 80
Shevardnadze Supported, CIS Opposed in Poll *[DRONI 22 Feb]* 81
Successor to Throne Suffers Heart Attack *[INTERFAX]* 81
Trade Minister Thanks Russia for Food Aid *[INTERFAX]* 81
Justice Official on Registration of Parties *[SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA 14 Feb]* 81

BALTIC STATES

Latvia

Supreme Council Adopts Privatization Program *[Riga Radio]* 83
Medicine, Communication Prices Increase *[Riga International]* 83
First Installments to European Bank Made *[BALTFAX]* 83
Former Party Officials Restricted From Posts *[Riga International]* 83
Redeployment, Social Options for Troops Cited *[IZVESTIYA 3 Mar]* 84
Recognition for Victims of Nazism Urged *[Riga International]* 85
Investigation Begins in Missing Grain Supplies *[Riga International]* 85

Lithuania

Butkevicius, Mironov Discusses Withdrawal *[Vilnius Radio]* 85
    First Unit Exits Visoriai *[TASS]* 85
    Authorities Refuse Recognition *[BALTFAX]* 86
National Defense Faces 'Sufficient Problems' *[Vilnius Radio]* 86
Envoy to Russia Denies Claim to Kaliningrad *[IZVESTIYA 3 Mar]* 86
    Ambassador's Position Not 'Official' *[BALTFAX]* 87
Eastern Lithuanian Community Founded *[Vilnius Radio]* 87
Questioning of Former OMON Official Allowed *[BALTFAX]* 88
U.S. Grain Shipment Arrives in Klaipeda *[Vilnius Radio]* 88

Arbatov Argues Against Joint SDI Program

MK0403115592 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 4 Mar 92 p 2

["Opinion" by Aleksey Arbatov, director of Center for Disarmament and Strategic Stability, Foreign Policy Association: "Joint SDI: Will It Promote Anyone's Security? There Are No Free Lunches in Politics Or in Strategy"]

[Text] The Russian leadership's initiative on jointly creating global ABM defenses with the United States has once again prompted discussion of what seemed a totally hackneyed problem over the last few years. A. Savelyev's interview headlined "SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative] Is Optimum Scenario for Joint Defense System for Us" (NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 18 February 1992) injects a new, extremely unexpected turn into the debates.

Before examining this specialist's idea, let us remember the crux of the issue. The position espoused by the supporters of the current limited version of SDI is that a ground- and space-based ABM system is needed to repulse individual missile attacks by Third World countries, nuclear terrorists, or unauthorized accidental launches.

It is claimed that both sides' deployment of ABM systems as agreed during the talks will not weaken their mutual ability to inflict a retaliatory strike since defensive systems will only have a limited intercept capability. In other words, defense systems will not make it possible to inflict a first strike and repulse retaliation using ABM defenses.

The opponents of expanding ABM systems retort that "limited" ABM systems costing $50 billion each will not perform their tasks, will divert resources from more effective ways of resolving the problem, and may moreover create considerable difficulties for strategic relations between the great powers.

Start with the fact that an intercontinental ballistic missile [ICBM] is the most costly and awkward delivery vehicle for nuclear munitions for a regime like Saddam Husayn's or for a terrorist group. It cannot be concealed, it is an ideal target on the launch pad for an air or missile strike, and it takes tremendous resources to maintain in a state of combat readiness.

If terrorists or new [Saddam] Husayns acquire nuclear weapons, they will put them on an aircraft, cutter, or mobile operational-tactical missile. A space-based ABM system will not provide protection from this. Moreover, if the great powers deploy ABM defenses that will tell criminals many years in advance to concentrate on other means of delivering nuclear missiles apart from ICBM's.

The irrationality of SDI is particularly obvious if you take into consideration the fact that the tens of billions of dollars allocated for it will not be used for more effective ways of combating the threat. I am referring to expanding the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA] inspectorate; new (including space-based) systems to monitor the use of nuclear technology and materials; funding an economic "stick and carrot" regime depending on the line taken by states, including CIS members, on questions of nuclear nonproliferation; and creating kinds of AES [nuclear electric power station], etc. that are safer from this viewpoint.

Finally, money is also needed for international armed forces capable of implementing military sanctions against people who violate the nonproliferation regime. Russia and the United States may need to cooperate in creating reliable mobile ABM systems to provide protection against tactical missiles, new defense systems, aviation, and cruise missiles and in improving airspace surveillance systems.

Given the worsening budgetary problems in both Russia and the United States, there is not enough money for everything. Choosing SDI will of course support military-space firms in our country and the United States, but it will make the situation for the rest of the defense industry, not to mention the civilian economy, even more difficult. As for security, a space shield may protect us from imaginary threats in the next century. However, it will take away money needed to cope with more earthly, real dangers this decade.

It is obvious that this choice is even more acute for Russia than for the United States, not only for economic reasons, but also because of the problems within the CIS. Where are the early-warning ABM radars, the bases for ground-launched interceptor missiles, the new space communications stations, and modernized cosmodromes to be sited? With which enterprises are orders to be placed and where are transport routes and control and power supply lines going to go?

If everything happens on Russian territory alone, the other republics will immediately realize that Moscow has decided to defend itself without them and maybe even against them. It is simply hard to think up a better way of finishing off the CIS. But if the work is set in train within the present CIS, who will guarantee that the question will not arise in the near future of dividing up an ABM system that has cost many billions? Strategically and technically this is even greater madness than dividing up nuclear weapons. And is it certain that during the ABM's system's life cycle (it takes 10-15 years to deploy alone) Russia will have common enemies and allies with all its current CIS partners?

A host of problems arises in connection with the idea of joint SDI also with regard to Russian-U.S. bilateral relations. Everything indicates that Washington sees joint actions mainly as joint revision of the ABM treaty and nothing more. The United States will hardly make its own security and tremendous capital investments dependent on the development of the situation in Russia and the CIS. The instability and unpredictability of this situation are recognized everywhere as one of the incentives for continuing the U.S. SDI program.

The concept of a "dual key" for control of space-based ABM defenses is hardly feasible. Though it is simpler and safer to create a dual "lock" on strategic offensive arms, the Americans are somehow in no hurry to make this suggestion. Incidentally, cheaper, more effective devices for averting an accidental missile launch can indeed be developed—you only have to set a joint Russian-U.S. team of engineers the task.

Even with the most favorable course of relations between the two powers, the strategic dimension of these relations will consist for a long time to come in mutual deterrence—albeit with greatly reduced levels of potentials and with growing cooperation in ensuring strategic stability. That is the objective reality and it cannot be canceled out by a simple effort of political will, however much you may want to devise a rapid, simple way out of the situation that has taken shape. Dismantling gigantic arsenals of destruction that have taken decades to accumulate requires painstaking, dogged work, especially since during the seventies and eighties talks served more to legalize the arms race than to stop it. This work may be hampered by the deployment of ABM systems, which drastically complicates the balance and creates tremendous uncertainty regardless of the sides' intentions.

In view of all the above considerations and a number of others there is still considerable opposition in both Russia and the United States to the plans for a joint or parallel SDI program. Admittedly, the Russian leadership's recent initiatives will evidently help the Bush Administration to relax for a while the tough restrictions that the Capitol imposed on funding of the program. However, there are hardly grounds for considering the deployment of a space-based ABM system a foregone conclusion or for giving the ABM Treaty up for lost.

The U.S. Government's policy toward our country has of late merited the highest assessment. But strengthening relations with the United States is not equivalent to agreeing with the current administration in every respect. Especially since there are other influential forces in the United States apart from the administration that advocate friendship and cooperation with Russia, but oppose wastefulness in the form of a space-based antimissile system.

Now, let us return to the aforementioned article by A. Savelyev. It voices support for a space-based ABM program to provide protection from third countries and unauthorized launches. It claims that defense does not destabilize mutual deterrence since it will be incapable of stopping a retaliatory strike. The ABM Treaty is written off, and it is proposed that it be replaced with an agreement on the deployment of the kind of antimissile system that the United States is planning. All these ideas are nothing new and their untenability was mentioned above. But there is also an original idea here. Rightly pointing to the fact that Russia is now having difficulty in setting about creating its own similar system, the expert recommends that we "join" the U.S. SDI. In other words, we will help the United States eliminate the ABM Treaty and legalize SDI and in return for this it will protect us free of charge with a space shield from third countries and accidental launches. Rapidly, profitably, and safely, so to speak.

But that is only at first glance. The Americans will make us pay, and a great deal at that, for this protection. Which would, incidentally, be quite fair. A. Savelyev points out, for instance, that the current SDI scenario is designed to intercept 200 missiles at most, yet we have more than 2,000. So, the writer reassures us, this system won't intercept any retaliatory attack on our part.

But something that suits our specialist will hardly suit the U.S. taxpayer. He will say: What is going on, are we going to spend tens of billions of dollars defending ourselves and the Russians from the main threat while they continue to aim thousands of nuclear warheads at the United States? Food aid is one thing, but protecting defense might is something else again.

No, Americans will demand, let Russia unilaterally eliminate its nuclear arms. Especially since, as the author admits, the need for SDI is dictated by the situation within the CIS and the emergence there of three nuclear powers and seats of instability and tension. Since that is the case, let the Russians reorganize and redeploy their army and fleet as Washington says and in general accept U.S. leadership like other countries under the U.S. umbrella.

Russian-U.S. relations will change radically, there will hardly be a question of equal partnership. Or of any reciprocity in the talks, of maintaining the stability of mutual deterrence, or of mutual cuts in potential. After all, there is no question of this between the United States and Britain, much less between the United States and Japan or Germany. Yet the latter hold powerful economic trump cards...The new Russia will have to forget any autonomous role for a long time. To use an American expression, "there is no such thing as a free lunch" in politics or in military-strategic relations between the great powers.

Russia does not need its own or a U.S. space-based ABM system for its security. The same goes for U.S. security, which is what the overwhelming majority of prestigious U.S. independent specialists say. Strategically speaking, despite all our current economic and political troubles, we can continue to develop relations with the United States on the basis of equal cooperation in the interests of stability and mutual security. Provided, of course, that we do not take hasty, ill-considered steps.

'Control System' Safeguards Viewed

LD0203163092 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No. 4, Jan 92 pp 20-23

[Aleksey Arbatov article: "The Mysteries of the Nuclear Button"]

[Text] "Only I can start a nuclear war," Mikhail Gorbachev said in a French television interview shortly before his resignation. The former President's idea was not to scare but to reassure the world public: just rely on me, he implied, and I won't let you down. Can an important matter like that depend on the personal qualities of this or that leader? Obviously, more reliable safeguards are required. After all, nuclear arms control remains the key factor of global security. Information about the nuclear button in Moscow remains almost nothing. In the USA, which is no less security-minded than we are, this question is a subject of extensive press coverage and public discussion.

A skeleton key to the electronic lock

"The Button" is a journalistic image, of course, and it does not exist physically. The whole system is based on codes, ciphers, computers, various radio and telephone communication channels; the launching as such is done by a simultaneous turn of two keys.

Experts single out two nuclear arms control principles which can be referred to, conventionally, as the negative and the positive one. The negative principle means the use of technical facilities, system and procedures designed to rule out bringing nuclear weapons into action without the government's authorization.

This system was arranged in such a way - both in the USA and in the former USSR, - that neither the personnel of ground-based IBM control stations, nor missile carrying submarine and strategic bomber crews, nor the command posts of strategic units and fighting arms could physically start a nuclear attack unless they received special codes from above. If sent to missile crews via special communication lines, the codes are supposed to "unlatch" electric "locks" on nuclear arms.

The accepted launching procedures call for synchronous actions by many links in the system as a precaution against error, evil intent or mental derangement. Commands issued by any command station will be fulfilled only if acknowledged by all the others. The units which guard and maintain nuclear facilities in depots are accountable to superiors other than those of the missile forces. Unauthorized attempts to launch missiles trigger an alarm signal and can be blocked from above. Regulations demand that if ordered by his immediate superior to launch a missile, an operator should do so only upon the Presidential confirmation of the order.

As to the positive control system, it comprises the ways and means of guaranteeing authorized use of nuclear weapons despite likely obstacles or opposition. These facilities include, above all, multiplexed channels of underground, underwater, ground, atmospheric and space communication channels connecting those in command with the missilemen. At the action level, the destruction of some launch control posts does not prevent the same missiles from being launched from the surviving posts. As a last resort, certain types of missiles can be launched directly by a command from the centre, by-passing local launch control posts.

In times of crisis, launch control posts can be authorized to act on their own if the country's leadership is eliminated by a surprise strike. In that case the very communication blackout may serve as a signal to launch ballistic missiles.

This probably explains what transpired after the August putsch: Gorbachev was not the only one to possess the "attache case" - the Minister of Defence and the Chief of the General Staff also had them. If only the three of them could sanction a nuclear strike together (i.e. shared the unlocking code among themselves), this arrangement strikes me as strange. After all, the President stands higher in the hierarchy than the heads of the Defence Ministry. The latter's job is not to confirm or cancel the decisions of the head of state but rather to execute them. The existence of three "attache cases" can be explained by the desire to have other buttons besides the President's.

Communication vessels

As a matter of fact, the control system is not divided into negative and positive ones. It is a single system of control and communications which comprises elements of negative and positive control. What's more, these elements are like communicating vessels: the higher the level in one, the less full the other. This means that the higher the guarantee of striking a retaliatory blow under the least favourable circumstances, the less reliable the insurance against a non-sanctioned launching or against a nuclear strike caused by an error or overreaction to a threat.

Here is an illustration. If elevated to the absolute, positive control would mean a direct connection of early warning satellites and radars and of nuclear blast pickups with missile launching sites. The system could be made fully automatic and launch missiles even upon losing contact with early warning systems and with the central leadership. In that case, retaliation would be fully guaranteed, but the risk of a nuclear war breaking out through a technical fault would be enormous.

The other extreme is to divide negative control among dozen or so officers and to make the unlocking of weapons at the launching site level practically impossible unless all the "attache case" owners sanction it. In that case an unsanctioned nuclear strike or one carried out by mistake would be extremely unlikely. However, if at least one of the leaders gets killed or otherwise unreachable, the retaliation potential will be paralyzed.

It should be pointed out for fairness' sake that even in the past decades of the cold war, both the USA and the USSR emphasized negative control for fear of causing a global holocaust as a result of unsanctioned actions by missilemen or a technical error. There were substantial differences between the two nations' systems, however.

Is there "military-political leadership" in Washington?

Division of authority and the military command's unqualified subordination to the lawfully elected political leadership have also been the very basis of the American system of government. This finds its expression, above all, in the President appointing a civilian Defence Secretary who has an enormous staff under him and in the National Security Council and Congress having control over all military matters.

The U.S. Constitution has established the following sequence of power transfer in the event of the President's death or removal from office: the Vice-President; the Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Senate majority leader; the Secretary of State; the Secretary of the Treasury; the Secretary of Defence and so on. The "button" of the strategic forces control system changes hands in the same order.

Billions have been invested in ensuring political control over the use of strategic arms even after a multiple exchange of nuclear strikes. The only function assigned to the military—from the top level of the Joint Chiefs of Staff all the way down to the missile crews—is to executive orders.

In the Soviet Union, the control system mirrored the totalitarian and highly militarized nature of the political regime. Much attention was paid to the negative control over local action stations, and any division of authority or primacy of political leadership, let alone a legalized sequence of power transfer, were out of the question. Even the standard Soviet term, "military- political leadership," having no analogues in Western vocabulary, speaks for itself.

The leadership of the Party exercised control over Army generals through the Glavpur (Military Political Administration) and by personnel manipulations. The Army was counterbalanced, to some extent, by the KGB which, in particular, was responsible for government communications and had certain links of the nuclear forces' command and security system under its control. Outside that, the military were free to decide on the ways and means of waving a war and winning a "victory" in a global nuclear conflict.

If the General Secretary oversleeps...

The USSR's strategic forces, in which stationary ground-based IBMs predominated, constituting up to 70 percent of the total in terms of warheads, were intended for a preventive strike and, in the 1970-1980s, for a so-called counter- or relative-counter strike. That is to say, they were to be launched before the war-heads of U.S. missiles hit our launching sites and launch control posts. Why so? Because the launching of the missiles at signals received from warning systems would make it possible to drop seven thousand megatons of nuclear explosives on American territory. On the other hand, if American warheads had hit their targets before that, the attack would have left us with "only" a few hundred or one or two thousand megatons with which to retaliate.

The generals have always dismissed as nonsense the argument that several thousand megatons differs little from a few hundred megatons. The point is that 150 largest U.S. cites harbour over 560 percent of the U.S. population and ⅔ of industry.

As a matter of fact, our strategy amounts to depriving the political leadership of the right to make a decision to use nuclear weapons. The time paramaters of a nuclear cataclysm are such that a counter-strike can succeed only if politicians are capable of a split-second reaction, and even then only if everything works smoothly. Besides, the politicians will have to depend wholly on signals—mysterious to them—coming in from satellites and warning radars, or rather on the interpretations of these signals by the military.

If a strike is delivered with a submarine-borne ballistic missile at a relatively short distance from the target, even the most efficient control system will be of no use. In anticipation of that, politicians may be asked to sanction a nuclear strike in advance on the grounds that there will be no time for drawing up new plans of operations if the existing ones are thwarted. The leader's role will be reduced to that of a chimpanzee used for testing: he will just have to push a button when a lamp comes on.

Now if the General Secretary has overslept, become unreached or been removed from office, the go-ahead can be given without his authorization. All the codes are converted into action, and all the communication channels are maintained by military services for which instructions from their immediate superiors are law.

In other words, at the top level of leadership, positive control has always taken precedence over negative control. The monopoly of the military on working out the control system and operations plan (for a counter-strike, above all) has materialized in a concept which guards not against an accidental strike due to a mistake, a nervous breakdown or a technical problem, but against failure to respond to an attack promptly and on a massive scale.

This is a reflection of a typically militaristic mentality—the main goal is to crush the enemy, deterrence is just a sideline. For a politician, on the other hand, deterrence comes first. If deterrents fail to work and a nuclear attack is made, all the rest will make no difference any longer.

Many remain under the spell of military declarations like "an immediate and crushing retaliation" which "no aggressor will avoid." Even Yuriy Rostov, the anchor man of a TV news programme whom I highly respect, has said recently that a nuclear attack should be "instantly" reacted to, otherwise catastrophe will ensure.

What does he mean by "catastrophe?" The prospect of us dropping fewer megatons on the US than planned by our General Staff? If we indeed come under a nuclear attack, this will be catastrophe in and of itself, and our fate will hardly depend in this case on how many million Americans we kill in retaliation. If we react "instantly" but mistakenly, we shall really bring catastrophe upon ourselves and upon the rest of the world.

In the past decades this system did work, however, probably for the reason that it never underwent a real test. The superpowers feared each other so much that after the Cuban missile crisis they never pushed the world to the brink. Nevertheless, our system has proved to be no good at all in the dramatically changing situation inside the country.

It's against the rules, but it can be done

When we had the "military-political" leadership - the triumvirate of the CPSU, the KGB and the Military-Industrial Complex - our nuclear forces were under reliable centralized control (its reliability was not, thank God, given the acid test like the one failed by the Chernobyl nuclear power plant's control system). The deepening rift in our society and Gorbachev's prolonged vacillation between the Right and the Left led to the August putsch which, in addition to everything else, demonstrated the utter inadequacy of the old nuclear arms control system under new circumstances. Having colluded, the top brass and the KGB debarred the President from control over nuclear weapons with amazing ease.

The vague subsequent assurances to the effect that everything was in perfect order and that details are state secrets hardly make sense. It sounds incredible that without the President's sanctions and the codes there are no means of launching the missiles. The military know, of course, that they are not supposed to do that, but then they are not supposed to stage coups, either. The important thing is that this is probably possible technically, otherwise the counter-strike strategy would be impracticable. Surely, certain arrangements have been made to deal with a situation where the leader is no longer in control. And if it is technically possible to launch a missile without the President following a nuclear attack, then this can be done following a coup also.

It is not hard to guess who was, on those days, in charge of the services which make up codes and combinations and which maintain government communications with the strategic missile launch posts. Besides, there are facilities for launching missiles right from the centre, by-passing local triggering systems.

Some political scientists are trying to reassure themselves and others by reasoning that the conspirators - all of them top executives of the Gorbachev government - would have displayed a sense of responsibility in the matter of "button control." What would have happened, however, if the putsch hadn't failed so quickly? What if the White House had been taken by storm with all the consequences - civil war, a split of the Army, the warring factions' attempts to win outside support? There are no answers to these questions, but one thing is clear - the old control system is unfit for the new reality.

The "attache case" changes hands

The breakup of the USSR after the August events, the formation of the CIS, the signing of the agreements on joint measures as regards nuclear weapons and on strategic forces - all this has lent special urgency to the "button" problem.

Matters have certainly been simplified by the agreement reached by the independent states to the effect that technical control is to be exercised by the President of Russia only. The heads of the other Republics which have strategic nuclear arms on their territories so far are to give oral consent to the use of these arms, if necessary. The sharing of the "button" among the independent states would contradict the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and on the reduction of strategic offensive arms.

There are quite a few problems, however. The President of Russia has control over all nuclear weapons, but other Republics maintain that the missiles deployed on their territories do not belong to Russia. By forbidding the withdrawal or elimination of these missiles without their knowledge and consent, the Republics claim certain rights to strategic weapons and do not recognize Russia as the nuclear successor to the USSR. However, they have no technical control over the use of these weapons.

Further, although the president of Russia does have control over the "button," the Commander-in-Chief and the joint command of strategic forces, obliged to take their instructions from political leadership, are subordinated not to him but to the Council of the CIS Heads of State. The other presidents are not in control of the "button," however, and their vetoes or sanctions are of a procedural character. Does that mean that strategic forces are subordinated to Russia after all? No, Russia has no army of its own, and nuclear facilities belong to the joint command within the framework of the CIS. At the same time, the Commonwealth has no central authorities, it is a union of states, not a state. It has its centre in Minsk, and its Defence Ministry and General Staff in Moscow.

It looks as if under the circumstances no political power is in control of the Army and, in particular, of strategic forces.

The "attache case", it is true, has been handed over by Gorbachev to Yeltsin. They showed on television the other day how the military teach Yeltsin to handle his new "luggage". This is probably the same "attache case" that was lost in Foros last August. This means that the control system, crowned with the "button," remains actually the same. The President of Russia has probably not yet taken precautions against landing in his federal predecessor's predicament.

The system in need of readjustment

The most logical and consistent thing to do would be to eliminate all the strategic weapons and tactical nuclear facilities on the territories outside Russia. A model for this is found in the Minsk agreement as regards Ukraine. The reduction of the nuclear potential in this way fits in with the obligations ensuing from the Soviet-American Treaty on Strategic Arms Reduction signed in the summer of 1991, and from the exchange of the Bush and Gorbachev initiatives that autumn. Therefore, no "pumping over" of nuclear might from the Republics to Russia will take place: the arsenals on Russian territory will be reduced even further.

The missiles stationed outside Russia are to be deactivated in good time. In that case, everything—the deployment procedure, the right to ownership and use, the control system—will click back into place.

This is far from all. It is necessary to restructure the control system in Russia so as to get rid of the faults inherited from the totalitarian militarist structure of the USSR. Specifically, the working out of sanctioning codes and ciphers, putting them into the control post computers, installing the locking devices, maintaining special communications—all these functions should be handed over to a service independent of the Defence Ministry and the KGB and subordinated to the President only.

It appears that in our case "negative" control ought to be divided among the President, Vice-President and the Chairman of Parliament so that the sanctioning of a nuclear strike should call for the technical alignment of all three parts of the code. It is also necessary to determine, by a special law, the continuity of transfer of the authority over nuclear weapons from the three top executives to the subordinate civilian officials.

It is time we gave up the counter-strike strategy which reduces the political leadership's control over the Army to a fiction and leaves open the ways to by-pass the President's button in peacetime.

It is necessary to eliminate the facilities for prompt missile launchings in case of the President's death in a nuclear attack. Instead, we had better provide the technical means for a prompt and efficient transfer of his powers to his lawful successors.

Finally, in order to prevent an unconstitutional takeover of power, measures should be taken for the control system to be completely "switched off" in such an event—i.e. for making it technically impossible, for a lengthy period, to launch strategic missiles.

Military experts will argue, of course, that all this is bound to impede nuclear retaliation, to reduce its impact, to weaken deterrence. This is true, I agree, but military potential is not a thing in itself—the fundamental changes now in progress within the country and in the rest of the world call for its restructuring.

The potential of deterrence at the level of reasonable sufficiency should be preserve as an inalienable element of global strategic stability. The very criteria of sufficiency are to be revised, however. The USA is now less likely than ever to mount a surprise nuclear attack, and it is hard to think up convincing reasons why the situation should change in the foreseeable future.

At the same time, the danger of nuclear arms control loosening up as a result of ethnic strife and domestic social and political unrest in the former USSR has grown. In their turn, the radical transformations of society and the state call for a substantial readjustment of the nuclear weapons control system. Otherwise, events like the August putsch, dangerous to our country and to the whole world, may recur.

It stands to reason that no organizational or technical measures will make up for the absence of economic and socio-political stability in society and in the Army. The fact remains, though, that the USSR has built up a huge nuclear arsenal, so it is our moral duty to see to it that the mistakes we make at home should not put the entire civilized world in mortal danger.

Case for Joint Space Defenses Rebutted

PM2802160992 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Feb 92 pp 2,3

[Lieutenant Colonel A. Dokuchayev article under the rubric "Military Observer's Notes": "'Brilliant Pebbles' Over Russia And Vaults Under It"]

[Text] What awaits us in the near future if we continue to philosophize about a global space protection system?

For over six months now questions of creating an ABM space defense system have been actively discussed in our society. They have now become very topical in connection with the fact that B.N. Yeltsin has recently proposed that a joint global space defense system be created, based on the U.S. SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative] and Russian defense complex development projects.

Where Did the Pebbles Come From

The first proposals on the "internationalization," or to be more precise, the occupation of space, came from across the ocean a few years ago. This was followed by hints from the United States along the lines of: If our side shut its eyes to the 1972 ABM Treaty, we would be admitted into SDI, whose purpose is exclusively to protect against rogue intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The scientific world has now started talking with all its might about a joint global protection system. The reason for this is the American "brilliant pebbles" technology. Its authors have essentially put forward a new ABM defense system. What does it comprise? A group of small missiles (weighing up to 40 kg) are permanently in space in a "suspended" state; these are self-guided toward an infra-red radiation source. Such a missile is called a "brilliant pebble." It is capable of attacking a missile in its boost phase from space. According to experts' claims, in conjunction with a space information system capable of registering the launch of a missile and performing the task of target allocation, "brilliant pebbles" will direct the necessary number of "pebbles" at the target.

That is the technology that the world community could press into service according to certain scientists at home and abroad (and as we can see, they have gotten as far as the Russian president's door). The reins of control could be concentrated in the United Nations. According to Academician N. Moiseyev, the initiator of discussions in ZA RUBEZHOM newspaper, every launch of a ballistic missile which is not sanctioned by a special UN commission would automatically trigger the targeting at this missile of a number of "brilliant pebbles" which would shoot it down in the boost phase.

"Brilliant pebbles" is an important component of the SDI program, whose formation was announced by U.S. President R. Reagan in March 1983. Since that time the program has undergone certain amendments. In 1988, with the emergence of the concept of "brilliant pebbles" space interceptors. And in 1990-1991, with the change in the military-political situation in the world, when a new ABM structure was put forward geared to repulsing only limited strikes rather than a full-scale threat. It was given the name GPALS—"Global Protection Against Limited Strikes." And it looked attractive. Because it is allegedly not targeted against Russia, a strike from whom it is not capable of deterring. A basis for discussions on joint projects emerged.

Until recently the disputes were of a purely theoretical nature. Today they have materialized into an initiative of the Russian president. And that is rather more than an abstract discussion between academics. Boris Yeltsin stated that "we are prepared to jointly elaborate a global protection system instead of SDI, and subsequently create and jointly use it." So far it has not been clarified which of the specialists prepared the proposals for the president's statement. Speaking in Geneva 12 February, Russian Foreign Minister A. Kozyrev explained that the initiative presupposes joint research which would "help solve the problem of preventing the 'brain drain' from the defense complex of the nuclear-space states." The results of such work could be used "for peaceful purposes in the interests of the whole international community."

What Do the Americans Want?

First of all, something about the reaction on the other side of the ocean to the Russian president's initiative. So far the Americans have reacted in an excessively restrained way. So far, as U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker's recent visit to Moscow confirmed, the sides have not reached mutual understanding on Yeltsin's proposal. Admittedly there is the agreement on the creation of a joint center for early warning of the launch of ballistic missiles (it has not yet been decided either where it will be located or when construction will start).

It seems that this might have been expected. It would be naive to hope that the Americans will now give us a share in and access to state-of-the-art "star wars" technology (if only in the light of the ban on American companies participating in laying down telephone fiber optic cable to Siberia). Because originally SDI was created for other purposes—to achieve military-strategic supremacy over the former Soviet Union. Although in fact, with the adoption of the GPALS program, they stated that the most important thing for them now is protection against limited missile strikes, that is, accidental unsanctioned missile launches.

It seems that the GPALS system is a subtle and far-sighted step for the transatlantic strategists. Why? We will deal with that aspect a bit later. But now, something about the purpose of the system.

The Americans want to develop the country's ABM defense system. It is proposed that the GPALS system will consist of two tiers—a ground-based one and a space-based one. For its part, the ground-based one will consist of two components—a strategic one, intended for the protection of U.S. territory from a limited strategic ballistic missile strike, and a tactical one, to protect the troops of the United States and their allies in a theater of military operations from strikes by operational-tactical and tactical missiles. So, it is planned that the strategic component will have up to 750 long-range ground-launched stationary interceptor missiles (which is 7.5 times greater than the corresponding restrictions established by the 1974 protocol to the ABM Treaty), as well as mobile radar facilities. The tactical component's interception system, that is, the "Patriot" surface-to-air missile system, does not come under the treaty. It is intended that the space-based tier of GPALS will have an all-purpose system: up to 1,000 space-based interceptor missiles and orbital systems tracking ballistic missile warheads and issuing target destinations, including for ground-launched interceptor missiles. It is considered that GPALS is capable of intercepting 200 warheads in the event of a missile strike on U.S. territory.

The main difficulty for the Americans is that in order to implement these plans you have to go (far) beyond the framework of the ABM Treaty. At the moment the Americans themselves do not want to violate it. How would they look in the eyes of the world community? But apparently if our initiatives continue to be ill-considered, the United States will receive Russia's blessing to get out of the ABM Treaty. After all, joint work on the defense initiative and observance of the treaty's provisions are simply incompatible. In a word, at first the Americans receive the blessing for a limited protection system. The technology that has been developed will enable them to beef up [uplotnit] ABM defense on U.S. territory in a short time and fill space with "brilliant pebbles." Thus, by the year 2005, kinetic energy weapons and laser complex weapons actually in space [sentence as published]. And that means introducing an extremely strong destabilizing factor into our lives.

And then, according to experts, the development of defensive weapons cannot be seen in isolation from the improvement of offensive weapons. It turns out that the

Americans are more familiar with Hegelian dialectics than we are. They are not only speeding up work on the creation of full-scale ABM defense, but they have also started implementing a program for "taking out" (completely) a potential enemy's state-of-the-art ballistic missiles. Analysis shows that if they work successfully on the two fronts, they can achieve the complete neutralization of foreign strategic nuclear forces between the years 2000 and 2005. It is assumed that the effectiveness of the nuclear missile weapons which we, for example, will have left by then, will effectively be zero.

Soviet specialists had differing attitudes to the SDI program; frequently it was one of skepticism, like, for example, the attitude of many American missile officers to our own ABM defense: they say it would not withstand a massive strike. Both of them are right. Today or tomorrow, or approximately until the end of the century, SDI will scarcely be able to provide protection against a heavy strike—it will not be possible to intercept all missiles, and that means it is pointless to make a fuss. But what will happen the day after tomorrow?

The day after tomorrow, experts in the Joint Armed Forces High Command and the Russian defense complex, who did not want their names to be published in the press, believe, the capabilities of SDI will be such that it will quite simply be no longer necessary to maintain and service our ballistic missiles. If we stop improving offensive weapons, or more precisely weapons of deterrence, while across the ocean capital will be poured more actively every year into SDI, then soon we will simply not be in a position to penetrate the "brilliant umbrella."

Here we need another small explanation. Missiles are all different. Ballistic missiles of the first generations, which were not intended to penetrate ABM defenses, are one thing. Missiles that are capable of penetrating an ABM system are another. So step by step the Americans are forcing us to abandon the elaboration of various new missile programs. They themselves, however, are intensifying efforts in the implementation of defense initiatives, and indeed they are not giving up new offensive weapons systems.

Why have Soviet specialists become skeptical? Let us have a look at quotations that came from across the ocean last year.

"The Pentagon has carried out successful tests of the 'ERIS' ground-based exoatmospheric interceptor within the framework of the elaboration of the SDI program. It was launched from the Kwajalein Atoll test range in the Pacific Ocean and at an altitude of 100 miles intercepted and destroyed on contact a 'Minuteman' intercontinental ballistic missile launched from the Vandenberg (California) U.S. Air Force base. During the tests, decoys were used, which made it difficult to identify warheads. The use of an improved aiming and guidance system is assessed by certain American specialists as a violation of the 1972 ABM Treaty."

"The U.S. Department of Defense has carried out a successful test of antimissile technology over Florida within the framework of the 'Star Wars' program. The experiment was carried out with the assistance of measuring instruments which were put into the sky by a small research rocket which was successfully launched from Cape Canaveral. An experiment forming part of the 'Red Tigress' project culminated in the placing of actual and diversionary targets were at an altitude of 100-400 km. The data gathered will be used by scientists in the creation of sensors for satellites being developed for a 'Star Wars' anti-missile system based in space."

That information was about the technical aspect, and now something about the financial aspect.

"The U.S. Congress Senate Armed Services Committee advocated allocating $4.6 billion in fiscal 1992 to realize programs within the framework of SDI. The so-called 'Star Wars' package was adopted. This package provides for deploying a ground-based ABM defense system using sensors based in space by 1996."

Things are no worse across the ocean on the second front either—in the business of missile "destruction." It seems that for a long time now, since Mikhail Gorbachev's accession to power and the appearance in his entourage of what many believe to be a pro-American lobby, one side, in my view, has been making all the moves in the U.S.-USSR (Russia) chess game—both for itself and for its opponent.

The Soviet-American Treaty on Strategic Arms Reduction and Limitation, which official Soviet experts evaluated as balanced and well thought-out, was signed 31 July 1991. While I do not object to that evaluation on the whole, let me draw attention to the following fact—we agreed to an overall reduction of 900 units, of which 154 are ICBMs, which is 50 percent of our existing total. (The United States will reduce delivery vehicles by 622 units.) While cutting its heavy missiles, the USSR undertook not to build, test, or deploy new types of these missiles, although they are entitled to modernize them. Note that the USSR made significant concessions, which were compensated by the United States' accepting an important condition. "Our partners have agreed to the demand to observe the 1972 ABM Treaty," Marshal Dmitriy Yazov noted in his defense minister days, "because deep cuts in strategic offensive weapons are impossible without a ban on building and deploying a large-scale ABM defense system." Look closely at this sentence, esteemed reader.

In October 1991 U.S. President G. Bush launched an initiative in the sphere of nuclear disarmament, prompting reciprocal measures by the USSR. A week later M. Gorbachev issued a statement. The Soviet Union agreed to nonequivalent [neadekvatniye] measures. Today, however, I would just like to highlight certain provisions from the sides' commitments. First: The USSR undertook not to increase the number of rail-mobile ICBM rocket launchers and to refrain from modernizing these missiles. Thus, we did what the Americans had been seeking in the course of work on the START Treaty. The second fact: M. Gorbachev stated that the USSR was stopping the development of small-scale intercontinental ballistic missiles. Admittedly, G. Bush declared that he had given orders to stop development of the "Peacekeeper" intercontinental ballistic missile. But let's be more precise: The Americans have abandoned a project which was still in the initial stages, whereas we have destroyed a completed missile. It had even been taken to the proving ground for a test launch, which did not take place.

And within the framework of the Russian-U.S. January initiatives the Americans have again relinquished something they do not yet have. For example, the construction of a new small intercontinental ballistic missile. Instead, they preferred to modernize the control and guidance systems for existing "Minuteman" missiles. For our part, a reduction in the number of nuclear submarines with ballistic missiles (SSBN's) which are on alert duty was declared. I am focusing attention on this point for the following reason. Specialists have long recognized that the least vulnerable types of weapon are missile-armed submarines and mobile ground-based missile launchers. Their presence on both sides helps military-political stability as their invulnerability provides a second-strike capability, forestalling the temptation to strike first. Now the Americans are insisting on the accelerated destruction of our multiple-warhead heavy missiles, in particular the RS-20 (SS-18), while preserving their superiority in submarine-launched ballistic missiles.

It would seem that other criteria for stability have been found across the ocean. They would like Russia to be left with silos containing old single-warhead missiles which would be no match for the ABM defense system being deployed. In short, it could be that eventually (and experts believe that this could happen by the year 2005) Russia will have American "pebbles" above it and vaults containing nuclear weapons below it (what else can you call silos housing target missiles for the the "pebbles?"). Our weapons' effectiveness will be equivalent to "zero," and the "brilliant pebbles" will be able to destroy any missile from our silos directly, in the boost phase. This means that the nuclear missile deterrence factor will disappear.

I have to say that I am by no means an advocate of harsh confrontation. But the complete neutralization of the Russian shield will result in great instability in our life (objectively), despite the fact that most countries have peace-loving governments in power. Not for nothing are the French and British preserving their strategic potential as their pride and joy. At the same time it should not be forgotten that nuclear weapons were used once before to destroy two peaceful cities, and the decision, let us note, was made in the very place from which today's moves for the expedited creation of SDI derive.

Remember the Krasnoyarsk Radar Station

That is how things stand. Now it is being proposed that we set up an international space protection system. Protection against whom? Let's listen to what one learned gentleman, Academician N. Moiseyev, had to say: "The system will safeguard mankind from possible 'nuclear terrorism.' It will obviate the need for national nuclear arsenals while nonetheless preserving a small quantity of nuclear weapons under the strict control of a specialist international commission." But the terrorists don't have any missiles yet and are unlikely to have in the near future. Should they so wish, they will find dozens of other ways of delivering a nuclear bomb to its target. Remember how Mattheus Rust flew unhindered onto Moscow's Red Square. That very same day and in the very same type of aircraft—a Cessna—another pilot, Rafael del Pino from the Cuban Air Force, having decided to quit his homeland, crossed into U.S. air space without encountering any obstacles. As far as we know, he was not expected and he was only discovered at the point of landing. SDI is intended to combat the ballistic missiles of those countries which possess them, not terrorists. Russia's involvement in the "brilliant umbrella" is unlikely to make a great contribution to the fight against international terrorism: However, it will constitute Russia's blessing for the burial of the ABM Treaty, a fact which in the final analysis is of little benefit to anybody. Of course, access to state-of-the-art technology is important. And after that, joint work—this is a major step toward mutual understanding between two countries. Nevertheless, it is vital to think three times over before entering into an alliance in the sphere of SDI.

Thus, so far the United States has not made a single step which cannot be construed ambiguously. Since Reagan's time we have been made offers of cooperation, but it is a fairly strange kind of cooperation. Transatlantic specialists are moving toward the creation of a joint center to obtain early warning of ballistic missile launches while at the same time seeking to raze the Krasnoyarsk Radar Station to the ground. And there is cause to remember this today. Recently, Krasnoyarsk Kray Governor A. Veprev and Kray Presidential Representative Yu. Moskvich sent B. Yeltsin a letter asking that dismantling of the radar station building be suspended—the apparatus has already been dismantled. The building was handed over to the "Energetik" Association under the Russian Ministry of Fuel and Energy for use in the national economy, and there are plans to start producing furniture and joinery items. Kray leaders believe that if five stories of the building are preserved it could provide 60,000 square meters of production space and save around 200 million rubles in capital investment. But the Americans demand that it be reduced to "nothing." And the issue at hand is a radar station which was actually intended to monitor outer space, as the Americans are well aware having visited Krasnoyarsk: That is, it is intended for the very purposes which some of our own experts are now proposing that we strive to achieve together. Where is the sense in this?

Our defense complex is not experiencing the best of times but it is still capable of a great deal. It is possible that we will not acquire any new technology and that the Americans will have no qualms about using our achievements at no expense whatsoever, which is in fact what they are doing already. In the authoritative weekly AVIATION WEEK AND SPACE TECHNOLOGY, Alan Brown declared that for a long time now American military specialists have been actively employing inventions by Soviet scientists. Scientific advances by the Soviet physicist Petr Ufimtsev, published in 1962, meant a saving of up to 40 percent of the money allocated for the program to create the "Stealth" fighter, he noted. The Americans are showing an interest in Soviet "Topaz-2" space nuclear reactors, which are suitable for spy satellites, and the hypersonic ramjet engine which underwent testing at the end of last year. Such tests in the United States are scheduled at best for three or four years' time... Perhaps what will happen is—and again I must stress this—that our work will be used and we will never be given a key to the "brilliant umbrella." After all, the multinational forces which overpowered Iraq comprised contingents from many countries, but the decisions were made in Washington by the American leadership, headed by an American general.

In short, the following conclusion suggests itself. It is vital to perfect our own defense weapons and to devise state-of-the-art technology within the framework of the ABM Treaty, which has prevented the militarization of space up to now. And what needs to be discussed, it seems, is not the merits of a nonexistent global space protection system but rather how to ensure that "brilliant pebbles" with a transatlantic trademark do not twinkle over Russia.

'New Defense Logic' Needs Consideration

PM0403164192 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No. 7, Feb 92 (signed to press 11 Feb 92) pp 30-31

[Interview with Andrey Kokoshin, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, by Marina Shakina under the rubric "Problems of Security"; place and date not given: "How To Go On Living Without A Main Probable Adversary"—first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] New York-Moscow—During his visit to the United States, Boris Yeltsin put forward a number of fundamentally new initiatives in the sphere of nuclear arms control. What do they mean in the changed political situation? What role will nuclear arms play?

Andrey Kokoshin, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, answers NOVOYE VREMYA correspondent's questions.

[Shakina] President Yeltsin recently put forward the idea of global defense of the world community, proposing to use high technology developed both in Russia and as part of the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI]. How realistic is this idea?

[Kokoshin] Cooperation between the United States and Russia could be deep and active without any major production expenses. I have in mind primarily cooperation in the sphere of missile attack early warning systems, which both we and the United States possess—they are the world's largest systems with the most powerful specifications. Jointly we could virtually "cover" a sizeable part of the globe—at least the Northern Hemisphere.

An early warning system in itself is not a means of defense; it only enables a launch to be identified, and hence the question of a so-called smart [tonkaya] antimissile defense, which could defend the United States from accidental, unsanctioned launches and from strikes carried out by a relatively small number of ballistic missiles, is being actively discussed in the United States at the present time. These questions have long been discussed in our country too—we went mainly in different directions in the development of ABM [antiballistic missile] systems, but there was also much in common.

The ABM Treaty played a major role in the difficult times of our confrontation, therefore it must be treated with caution. The Russian president expressed support for observance of the ABM Treaty.

Economically, Russia is in a most difficult position, and therefore it cannot indulge in costly projects. But to maintain what we already have and not to let it collapse, to improve the missile attack early warning system, including through cooperation—this is a perfectly realistic task.

[Shakina] The five nuclear powers may agree on the reduction or even the destruction of nuclear weapons...Why then the costly "star wars" project with our participation?

[Kokoshin] They may agree on reduction, but as for the elimination of nuclear weapons, there are some doubts here. Suffice it to compare the recent proposals by U.S President Bush and President Yeltsin. We perceive some quite important discrepancies. We propose to go much further and deeper. The Americans are planning a phase of deeper reductions than are proposed under the Strategic Offensive Arms Reduction Treaty [START], but at a far higher level, at higher ceilings in comparison with ours. This is no accident. This position reflects their point of view not only on the role of the naval component of the strategic "triad," but also on the role of nuclear weapons as a whole. But I hope that a joint solution will be found in the very near future. The question of complete nuclear disarmament, unfortunately, is still not on yet. Though radical reductions in nuclear weapons are more realistic today than in 1985, when Gorbachev put this question on the agenda. The efforts of the second half of the eighties did not entirely go to waste.

[Shakina] You get the impression that we somehow want to "jump on the bandwagon" of the SDI project. The utilitarian goal of this initiative is clear: To somehow or other occupy nuclear physicists. All the same, why does the United States need us? We have no money, and as for brains...Surely they have enough brains?

[Kokoshin] I would reduce this idea to very specific, practical questions. I think that it is necessary to preserve that which already exists and genuinely functions. Also, it is necessary to work on systems which would make it possible to destroy missiles in the event of an unsanctioned launch. Formerly each side feared to introduce such systems, because the main concern was something different—for the missile to get off the ground, and not for the missile to be reliably guaranteed against launch. Specialists who worked on tactical control systems were always faced with a cruel dilemma: either a reliable security system against malefactors, or a quick-launch mechanism.

[Shakina] What are the prospects for relations between the four nuclear republics of the Commonwealth, in your view?

[Kokoshin] I fear that problems will indeed arise here. I hope that they will not exacerbate to the point where we look at one another across computer display screens. But the republics have nuclear weapons—that is a reality. Unfortunately, this problem was not resolved sufficiently quickly. It would be far better for Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan if all nuclear weapons were withdrawn from their territory to Russia by September-December of this year.

The presence of nuclear weapons is attracting the world community's attention to the republics. I do not think that a responsible leader will be found who will claim full-scale possession of nuclear weapons. This would at once put such a leader in an exceptionally difficult position in the world community, and within his own country. But we can already observe a certain marginal exploitation of this factor—as a means of exerting "pressure" in politics.

[Shakina] Perhaps it would make sense to somehow enshrine the accords on nuclear weapons in the republics which were reached back in Minsk? Each republic could say: Stop, we have changed our minds....

[Kokoshin] I believe that the negotiating process between the four republics of the CIS with nuclear weapons on their territories should be permanent, deep, and ramified, and not impetuous, as has been the case up till now. This, I believe was a great mistake by Ukraine and Russia. Emotional statements by politicians often replace serious practical work in our country. Because of our economic difficulties, our public are more distanced from nuclear problems than a large part of the Western public. Therefore the pace in solving the problems of nuclear weapons has somewhat slackened right now.

Now that the bipolar structure of confrontation has collapsed and the USSR has disintegrated, nuclear weapons have started playing a different role. Not everyone has realized this yet. Nuclear weapons are becoming primarily an element of political bargaining, no longer even between adversaries, but actually in relations between friends and allies. We see this not only in the CIS but also in the West. Look at Europe: France's nuclear weapons are beginning to play a political role which recently was not so evident. I am in any case convinced that de Gaulle created nuclear weapons not in order to deter us, but to raise the status of France, to bring it back to the ranks of great powers. Not for nothing did he put forward the concept of omnidirectional defense. French nuclear forces have their own targeting plan, their own system of military command and control, and their own early warning system. In the eyes of France's political elite the French nuclear deterrent is to a significant extent intended to counterbalance the might of several other states, and especially Germany's economic might. And yet France has extremely friendly relations with Germany at the present time.

Why does the U.S. elite not accept the idea of radically reducing nuclear weapons? Nuclear weapons are viewed as a status symbol in the United States. Clearly they want to remain the sole superpower. Nuclear weapons have lost their combat importance to a significant degree, but for them it important to retain a colossal aloofness from all others. We should not foster any illusions; we should remember that there still exists in the world, albeit transformed, a centralized power [tsentrosilovaya] structure. In this power structure, nuclear weapons continue to play a substantial, albeit reduced and transformed role.

It is being said increasingly often nowadays that, inasmuch as we and the United States are no longer adversaries, nuclear weapons should be retargeted against the South—this is being said both in the West and in our country. Against whom in the South? An era is approaching when the concept of a main probable adversary—an entirely traditional and almost key element—is due to disappear from military doctrine. There is no longer a main probable adversary, and the Armed Forces are only a kind of insurance policy in case of some unexpected eventuality. This decision shapes a whole new defense logic for the development of Armed Forces and industry—a mobilizational logic.

General Replies to Anti-Missile Treaty Critics

LD0303161292 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Text] Some experts believe a Soviet-American antimissile defense limitation treaty signed almost 20 years ago has no future. According to them, the treaty's foundations have been shaken by the Russian President, Boris Yeltsin, ideas of a global antimissile defense system.

A Radio Moscow correspondent asked the deputy chief of the law department in the CIS Unified Armed Forces General Staff, Major General Vladimir Kuklev, to comment on this problem.

[Kuklev recording in Russian fading into English translation] We stand firmly for the preservation of the antimissile defense treaty, which continues to play an important role in the provision of strategic stability. Without it, the reduction stipulated in the START treaty as well as the latest cuts initiated by the American and Russian presidents would be impossible. [end recording]

In Vladimir Kuklev's view, the antimissile defense treaty may finally become outdated, but not before the global antimissile defense system—if a positive decision is adopted—transforms from a political idea into a reality and comes into operation. It will apparently take much time, during which stability is to be maintained by the existing antimissile defense treaty.

But to make it this way, it is necessary to resolve some pressing problems first. One such problem is the question of a former Soviet missile attack warning radar station in Latvia, now a sovereign state which did not enter the new Commonwealth set up by the former Soviet republics. General Kuklev now presents his opinion on the matter:

[Kuklev recording fading to translation] I think the conditions for this station to remain in Latvia must be negotiated with its government. It is quite obvious that no matter what legal basis is used—a lease agreement or whatever it may be—the operation of the station should be ensured since it is an element in the general antimissile warning network. Any breakdown in its operation that may occur could affect stability, one thing that the Latvian government cannot fail to understand. [end recording]

Strains Among Nuclear Countries Threaten CIS

MK0403142592 Moscow KURANTY in Russian 4 Mar 92 p 6

[Report by Mikhail Shchipanov: "Forecast: Happiness Lies Not in Warheads, But..."]

[Text] KURANTY's strategic forecast that the fraternal nuclear countries—Belarus, Ukraine, and Kazakhstan—will not allow Russia to enjoy being the only legal successor to the Union in the highly prestigious field of nuclear disarmament has proved totally justified. Happiness for Alma-Ata, Kiev, and Minsk does not of course lie in actually possessing the formidable weapons, but in the political influence with which the nuclear warheads are literally "stuffed." It is the weapons being eliminated that will be the "password" for these states to join the narrow group of countries that influence big-league politics. Such a speedy reaction from Washington, which straight off expressed readiness to discuss the key problems of getting rid of some of the weapons with all the nuclear "brothers and sisters" at once, was rather less predictable. However, it is by no means hard to understand the Americans.

First, the United States is establishing parallel relations with all the former Soviet republics and in this situation jealous Kiev and Alma-Ata must not be given reason to think that Russia will remain Washington's privileged interlocutor. Second, seeing the increasing split and squabbles within the Commonwealth itself, the Americans are relying more on exerting their own direct influence in ridding primarily Ukraine and Belarus of the Union's nuclear legacy. Lastly, reinforcing the U.S. disarmament concept is a factor of no small importance in the talks with all nuclear republics at once, since for a number of extremely obvious reasons it is easier for Ukraine, Belarus, and even Kazakhstan to back U.S. proposals rather than Russian proposals and thus once again put "overweening" Moscow in its place.

What emerges from all this scandal in the Commonwealth's noble family? Above all, Russia has to switch to regular consultations on disarmament problems with the three republics. Namely preliminary consultations, rather than merely handing out documents. And probably at the highest level, moreover. "Small" Minsk meetings may arise, confined to the "nuclear" members of the CIS. But the emergence of a Commonwealth of Independent States within the Commonwealth of Independent States threatens the Commonwealth with increasing erosion and will fit in quite well with the Ukrainian concept of the Commonwealth as the Union's winding-up commission.

World Center for Nuclear Scientists Urged

AU2802152092 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 28 Feb 92 p 14

["Slightly abridged version" of interview with Yevgeniy Velikhov, director of the Kurchatov Laser and Nuclear Research Institute, by ARD correspondent Gerd Ruge, carried by the ARD satellite station Eins Plus on the "Tagesgespraech" program on 25 February; place and date not given: "Russia Is Selling Its Missile Defense Technology Worldwide"]

[Text] [Ruge] Many observers in the West are speaking about the danger of Soviet nuclear weapons or the know-how on building such weapons or even experienced scientists appearing in Third World countries and helping them produce nuclear weapons.

[Velikhov] I think there is a potential danger in this respect. It is not the case that something could happen now. But we have many opportunities to prevent this danger in time. Such a danger exists everywhere in the world. The scientists who in the past were dealing with the development of nuclear weapons must try to find new jobs at a time that is marked by disarmament, and they must feel certain in international cooperation. That is why it is time to set up a center that could help these scientists. The center would also deal with ecological projects, new energy resources, and other tasks that are connected with the transition to the market.

[Ruge] Were steps in this respect initiated before the new international center was agreed upon, or are the two centers interrelated?

[Velikhov] The idea was in the air. I think the initiative of U.S. Secretary of State Baker and German Foreign Minister Genscher came at the right moment and is based on reality. The initiative was prepared by the course of events.

[Ruge] Do you think the situation in the CIS has made it necessary to set up an international center like this one?

[Velikhov] Certainly, it is very important to us for several reasons. First, there is the problem of nonproliferation of know-how. To solve this problem, scientists must feel certain in an international environment and must really be able to reorient themselves toward new technical areas. Second, there is the problem of preserving the intellectual potential. Russia and the former Soviet Union invested considerable energies and resources in science. A substantial part of this research work was financed from the military budget.

So the first objective is the nonproliferation of know-how, and the second is the preservation of the intellectual potential. But there is another goal, a third objective. Much of what was done in the area of basic research and on the basis of military research commissions is no longer required today. There is no use for these things in Russia now because our industry is in a crisis, and there is no money to promote new uses. That is why I believe that scientists, in particular Russian scientists, should work for the international market of new ideas. The center will be advantageous for the West and for us because the West will get new technologies and interesting ideas.

[Ruge] As you know, there is the problem of dual use regarding the results of such research. How can the results involving military and peaceful use be kept apart within the framework of the envisaged international cooperation?

[Velikhov] First, we are now considering a common defense system, which would in particular involve information systems allowing the global monitoring of events happening somewhere in the world. These systems would be linked with a global intelligence network. Such a system could be used for advance warning of acts of aggression on the Earth and for advance warning regarding natural disasters as well as technical disasters caused by man. That would be a natural way of using military technology. In this case, we could differentiate clearly enough between military and nonmilitary tasks.

[Ruge] Could you give us the approximate number of people whose know-how would be dangerous, if they were to go to the Third World?

[Velikhov] Our estimate is that between 3,000 and 4,000 scientists and engineers have specially important knowledge about building weapons at a high technological level. There are, of course, many scientists who have indirect knowledge. But we assume that the number is between 3,000 and 4,000.

[Ruge] Is there a possibility of controlling the emigration of scientists to other countries? Many scientists from the former Soviet Union have meanwhile worked in sensitive areas at other research institutes of the world, in the United States and in Germany, for instance. Do you have any control of such people who have dangerous know-how and could go to the Third World with their knowledge?

[Velikhov] Information is one thing, control is another. We have, of course, all the information about these people. Regarding control, we have a liberal legislation now that is in line with the demands of the human rights charter. That is why we cannot control people by employing police measures. Control is necessary, but on the other hand, the living conditions and the working conditions of the scientists must be acceptable.

[Ruge] In what way will the CIS republics organize their future scientific cooperation? Will there be an academy of sciences as a controlling body comparable to the former academy of sciences, or will every republic pursue a different direction in scientific work?

[Velikhov] Cooperation will be complex. First, in the area of basic research, we are working together with the academies of sciences of the other republics. In addition, there are new international forms of cooperation. We will, for instance, set up an international laboratory which would be a free laboratory that would depend on voluntary financial appropriations for special research commissions. This form exists in all republics. The center that we are setting up will also have departments in Russia—for instance, in Chelyabinsk and Arzamas where nuclear weapons have been developed. I think another department will be set up in Kurchatov, in the Semipalatinsk area. We discussed this with Kazakhstan. There will probably also be a department somewhere in Ukraine because there is a large center in Ukraine that is internationally known for the development of ballistic missiles.

[Ruge] Which institutes in Russia will cooperate with the planned international center?

[Velikhov] We believe that direct connections will be created with Arzamas and Chelyabinsk-70. But the center will be in the small town of Troitsk near Moscow. We agreed on this because it is a good idea to have it there. We think a directorate should be formed that should consist of representatives from the founding countries—the United States, Germany, and Russia. The center should, however, be open to Western and non-Western countries and for groups of scientists from the former Soviet Union, irrespective of whether they come from CIS republics or not.

[Ruge] Regarding the idea—which was originally suggested by President Yeltsin and was taken up by President Bush—to consider U.S.-Russian joint research for a space-based missile defense system, do you think such a plan would have a chance?

[Velikhov] We have some experience in the area of technological exchanges, and we have conducted talks in this respect. Russian scientists—former Soviet scientists, most of whom are Russians—are in the lead in a number of technologies. There are other technological areas where the Americans are leading. Therefore, the scientists have discussed the exchange of technologies for about five years, and something is already being done in this connection. The United States has asked us to show it our nuclear energy resources for space. Such energy resources are very important for long space flights and for space-based projects such as high definition television. There are also other forms of exchange, and we believe that this sector will be expanded.

It is also a foregone conclusion for us to exchange information. We should develop a system that warns us about any aggressive act, any incidental or nonincidental missile launch and ensures the quick exchange of information, so that tensions can be decreased and every possibility of an inadequate, inappropriate response is ruled out. This is very important because it is an improvement on the advance warning centers that we have created together with the United States. I think this warning system could be used jointly by the United States, Europe, and other countries that wish to join it, including Russia and the CIS republics. In addition, other serious aspects must be discussed. For instance, we are prepared to sell the technology of our missile defense systems—purely defensive systems. In our view, they are better than the U.S. Patriot missiles. We already have consumers worldwide and are prepared to expand this commercial form of cooperation. We have certain experience in missile defense. To be quite honest, in the past we did not consider missile defense very promising because of the state of confrontation during the "cold war".

Investigation Continues Into Uranium Sales

LD2902222192 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 29 Feb 92

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] A report on the sale of our enriched uranium abroad broadcast by our Bonn correspondent Vladimir Kondratyev on 26 February was also confirmed by our Paris correspondent. French television plans a special program on this topic on 11 March. We, for our part, decided to continue the investigation. A Tajik journalist, Oleg Panfilov, has recently returned from Chkalovsk. He was the first of our colleagues to visit a uranium-processing plant. Our information: The main uranium-processing plant is situated in Chkalovsk, 17 km from Khodzhent. Uranium is also produced in Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan.

[Panfilov] I visited a major plant processing uranium ore. It is situated in the northern part of Tajikistan in Chkalovsk where uranium is enriched and where a black powder—the oxide—the so-called Uranium-238 is produced. The Techsnabeksport [Technical Supplies Export] association which arranged the sale of uranium from the Chkalovsk plant, among other plants of the former USSR, is most probably still engaged in the uranium trade. To the best of my knowledge the Chkalovsk plant had been selling natural uranium to the United States for the past five years. They were official deals but were dealt with by the Techsnabeksport association. The United States, Great Britain, France, China, and possibly Germany could have processed the Uranium-238 from Chkalovsk. So, it is very difficult to say to what extent it was possible for Tajikistan to carry out an independent sale of uranium to any other states. Though, in principle, I do not rule this out.

I inquired whether uranium could be sold privately, for example, as it had been reported in the STERN magazine and was published recently by IZVESTIYA. In principle, it became clear to me from my conversation with the plant's managers that uranium could be smuggled from the enterprise, but it is very dangerous to keep it for some time at home.

[Announcer] The Atomenergo [Atomic Energy] ceased to be a powerful supervisory body. Other concerns and associations are currently getting its functions.

[Panfilov] A corporation is being set up which should include Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and even Lithuania.

Strategic Bombers Taken Out of Production

PM0203150192 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 8

[Viktor Belikov report: "Strategic Bombers Taken Out of Production"]

[Text] Production of the most powerful winged combat machines in our air force—the Tu-160 supersonic missile-armed combat jet and the multirole Tu-95 [Tu-95 MS] long-range turboprop strategic bomber—is being discontinued under an agreement reached during recent talks in Moscow between B. Yeltsin and J. Baker. Both are strategic offensive weapons, like the U.S. supersonic B-2, production of which has also been halted.

According to military experts and the world press, Russia and the United States have taken a significant new step toward reducing their arsenals of the most formidable weapons. It is easy to see that that is the case when you familiarize yourself with some of the characteristics and combat capabilities of the aircraft.

Tu-95 multirole aircraft has for many years been the basis of our strategic aviation. Created 40 years ago, the aircraft has undergone a number of modernizations and been equipped with state-of-the-art systems. The Tu-114 transcontinental airliner was constructed on the basis of this aircraft and saw lengthy service. The modern version of the aircraft, which is equipped for midair refueling, is capable of remaining in flight for over 24 hours and maintaining a speed of 850 kph. Furthermore, it can carry a combat payload of 40 tonnes.

The supersonic Tu-160 is a product of relatively recent times, as you can see from its aerodynamic configuration, its variable wing geometry, and four turbojet engines, which ensure a speed of 2,200 kph with a takeoff weight of 280 tonnes. Over 100 onboard computers help the two pilots, the navigator, and the radar operator to carry out flights from one hemisphere to the other.

What is the future for aviation industry enterprises that manufactured strategic bombers? All the indications are that, thanks to conversion, their highly skilled collectives will not be left without work, since for all these years they have also been making aircraft for civil aviation alongside their military output. Instead of the multirole Tu-95, the Kuybyshev aircraft builders can now launch proper mass production of the medium-range Tu-154M, which is much in demand in our country and abroad. The Kazan Aviation Plant will replace the Tu-160 with additional production of the long-range Il-62M, and will subsequently launch series production of the latest Tu-204.

If they are removed from our arsenal, these aircraft which have cost many millions will not have to be scrapped. There are options for using them for nonmilitary purposes. In particular, the multirole Tu-95 could become flying laboratories, and they could also be used as effective carriers of containers of fire-extinguishing mixture in putting out forest fires in the taiga.

Small satellites or space freighters can be launched into orbit from on board the Tu-160 combat jet, using it as a flying cosmodrome. Using such a system, which has been given the name "Burlak," will be far cheaper than using ground-based launch facilities.

Journalists Visit World's Biggest Nuclear Sub

PM0303151992 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 1

[Special correspondents Viktor Litovkin, Dmitriy Khrupov report: "Our Correspondents Are First To Visit World's Biggest Submarine"]

[Text] Our special correspondents Viktor Litovkin and Dmitriy Khrupov have returned from a trip to the Red Banner Northern Fleet. They were the first central press journalists to visit the world's biggest and Russia's most modern nuclear-powered submarine—the Typhoon. This ship carries 21 ICBM's each with 10 nuclear warheads and until now has been top secret.

The IZVESTIYA staffers spent 72 hours on the ship together with its crew. They met with the leadership of the Northern Fleet and the naval base where the Typhoon is lying, with the command of this underwater missile-carrying cruiser, conversed with its specialists, visited all the ship's duty stations and sections, and they also went to the compound where officers' and warrant officers' families live and visited them as guests.

Where the Typhoon's missiles are aimed, how they are launched, what the submarine's unique feature is, how sailors serve and live on it, what problems concern them and their families—read all about it in the next issues of IZVESTIYA. Because the crew's problems are our whole fleet's problems.

[Moscow PRAVDA in Russia 29 February 1992 on page 2 carries an Aleksandr Chernyak report entitled "We Saw This Submarine" which reads: "On 27 February IZVESTIYA's front page carried an apparent sensation entitled 'Our Correspondents Are First To Visit World's Biggest Submarine.'

"Greetings, colleagues! Your desire to describe our fleet's difficult life is laudable. But you should have added: first, since PRAVDA staffers, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondents, and U.S. journalists visited it. The fact is that PRAVDA and KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondents happened to visit a Typhoon-class nuclear-powered submarine, which was then indeed still the first (now we have six of them), almost five years ago. A photograph of this submarine was published in PRAVDA 3 October 1987.

"Finally, we were informed today by the Navy Main Staff that U.S. journalists who were shooting a film visited the submarine before the IZVESTIYA staffers. Next time, esteemed colleagues, do not forget to take a look at the ship's log—absolutely all visits are recorded there."]

Dumped Chemical Weapons, Contamination Viewed

LD0103171392 Moscow TASS in English 1918 GMT 28 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Roman Zadunaiskiy]

[Text] Moscow, February 28 TASS—Russian and German scientists will soon estimate the circumstances of dumping captured German chemical weapons and their current state, Chairman of the International Committee for Peace, Disarmament and Ecological Security in Sea and Oceans Justice Major General (retired) Pyotr Barabolya told ITAR-TASS.

After the Second World War, almost 400,000 tonnes of the German Army's ammunition containing war gases (mustard gas, lewisite, phosgene and diphosgene) were dumped in various areas of the Baltic Sea, mainly in shallow water—the Kiel Bay, the Skagerrak Gulf and near the Bornholm Island—under the decision of the allies.

The war gas shells, bombs and reservoirs are going to ruin and becoming depressurized, according to experts' estimations. Approximately between 50,000 and 100,000 tonnes of war gases may get into the water.

"The allies had an erroneous theory that the chemical ammunition will cover up with a thick layer of silt and be preserved," said Barabolya.

"However, the ammunition was dumped in shallow water, currents and heavy gales mix up everything, and the Baltic Sea is boiling like a pot in bad weather. The situation can become threatening any moment."

Head of the CIS Navy Chemical Service Vice Admiral Viktor Skantsev told ITAR-TASS one can now speak only theoretically about the state of the dumped chemical weapons and a possibility of sea water contamination.

It is possible chemical air bombs' cases have already gone to ruin, as they were from three to four millimeter thick in contrast to cases of chemical shells with a thickness of up to 20 millimeters.

Reports on Nuclear Waste Burial 'Refuted'

PM0303144992 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1500 GMT 28 Feb 92

[From the "Novosti" newscast: Report by announcer]

[Text] Admiral Zaytsev, deputy commander in chief of the Commonwealth Navy, and Rear Admiral Zolotukin, directorate chief and head of operations at the Novaya Zemlya nuclear test ground, have refuted a report by Britain's ITN television company that nuclear fuel waste is being buried in the Novaya Zemlya region. Meanwhile, the international environmental protection organization "Greenpeace" has issued a report reiterating this claim. Its report was published in Oslo. Obviously, we will report in greater detail the arguments and counterarguments of the various sides.

Secrecy on Warsaw Pact Nuclear War Plans Hit

924P0097A Moscow KURANTY in Russian 7 Feb 92 p 3

[Article by Mikhail Shchipanov: "Will There Be Secrets From Our Ally?"]

[Text] The term "allies" born out of the latest Bush-Yeltsin dialogue seems somewhat premature. Countries that continue their nuclear confrontation, even though in much weakened form, have hardly merged in "cordial agreement." But even when after all the very radical strategic amputations now being planned have been carried out, Russia and America will still remain the owners of "above-norm" stocks of nuclear weapons, and old nuclear sins can and should be confessed now.

The fact that our, now Russian, "strategic" cupboard is overflowing with skeletons was shown by the recent find announced by FRG Defense Minister G. Stoltenberg. From part of the archives of the former GDR Army a secret plan has been brought out into the light of God's day that involved the delivery of a preemptive nuclear missile strike employing 840 nuclear warheads. In the event that armed conflict broke out in Grande Dame Europe, the Warsaw Pact planned immediately (kill a million with one blow) to smash the opposition of the NATO scoundrels and break through the enemy defenses. I am not about to bore the reader with the details of the great thrashing that was planned, but only remind you that the Kremlin, in its previous existence, repeatedly and increasingly swore on the humane principles of socialism never to be the first to use nuclear weapons under any circumstances.

But the trouble is not even that the enemy should know the locations of the missiles and the silos. Nor even that a shotgun at a wall might be fired. The main problem is that most American nuclear plans were declassified long ago, and chewed over and taken advantage of by our colleagues. We know what kinds of discussions used to go on at the top level among the Americans during the time of a state's nuclear monopoly. And the poetical names, like "dual strike," that were given to scenarios of nuclear destruction of enemies on the other side of the "iron curtain." They have all already been made devoid of embarrassment and tension and the reassurances given. It is almost indecent to recall the plans to deliver nuclear strikes on NATO's own territory, for example, in Northern Italy, to prevent a breakthrough by Warsaw Pact forces.

The "fresh wind" blowing on Soviet nuclear plans for destruction, and the plans of our troops, is another matter. There is something to talk about here, and a subject to return to: Are the patterns of military wisdom in the General Staff in Moscow outdated, they say. There in the post-perestroyka capital, as before, they maintain a silence about the scenarios which, it is claimed, were developed during maneuvers just two or three years ago. Perhaps the time has come to lift this burden from our soul and shake the nuclear dust from our feet? To pick up and publish the entire list of scenarios worked out and filed under the diabolical letter "N"?

Samsonov on Main Results of PRC Visit

PM0303142592 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Mar 92 p 3

[ITAR-TASS report: "Trip Continues"]

[Text] Beijing, 2 Mar—The six-day visit to China by Colonel General V.N. Samsonov, chief of the Joint Armed Forces General Staff, is over. He left Beijing for a brief working visit to Pyongyang this morning.

In his conversation with this ITAR-TASS correspondent, Colonel General Samsonov stressed that the main results of his stay in the PRC were the meetings with Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee and chairman of the PRC Central Military Council, and with the top leaders of China's Armed Forces. We clarified the position at both state and military level as regards the future of bilateral cooperation, interest in which has been expressed by both sides. All the prerequisites are in place to continue cooperation in the future. The meetings and talks held during the visit with a number of unit and combined unit commanders confirmed the conclusions we reached after high-level contacts—that is, the interest in reciprocal exchanges.

There was a discussion of the questions of Armed Forces cuts in the CIS and PRC border regions—taking account of the withdrawal currently in progress of the CIS troop contingent from Mongolia—the military leader continued. This year alone around 60,000 servicemen will return home, and thousands of tanks and artillery pieces and around 350 combat aircraft and helicopters will be withdrawn, he reported.

The sides discussed the direction of future military-technical cooperation. During this and next year China will receive 24 Su-27 aircraft under existing agreements. Our Chinese colleagues have been showing interest in the armaments used by the Ground Forces, Air Defense Forces, and the Air Force. During the visit the talk also turned to a new avenue of ties which, General Samsonov is convinced, will be implemented—military-scientific cooperation between the CIS Joint Armed Forces General Staff Academy and the People's Liberation Army Academy of Military Sciences.

The setting out of the avenues of the military doctrine we have elaborated, and our assessments of the military-political situation in the Asia-Pacific region generated lively interest from our Chinese partners. On the whole, it seems that the visit was useful for both sides, the chief of the CIS Joint Armed Forces General Staff said in conclusion.

Army Chief Signs Plan on DPRK Army Ties

LD0303141992 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1300 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Text] Colonel General Viktor Samsonov, chief of the General Staff of the CIS Armed Forces, has completed his visit to the DPRK. A plan for the development of ties between the command of the CIS Armed Forces and the Korean People's Army was signed in the course of the visit.

Replying to a question from an ITAR-TASS correspondent in Pyongyang, Samsonov said that currently, military supplies to the DPRK are delivered solely on a commercial basis.

Meets Kim Il-song

LD0303151992 Moscow TASS in English 1447 GMT 3 Mar 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vladimir Nadashkevich]

[Text] Pyongyang, March 3 (TASS)—Colonel-General Viktor Samsonov, chief of the General Staff of the Joint Armed Forces of the CIS, first deputy commander-in-chief of the Joint Armed Forces of the CIS, concluded his visit to North Korea on Tuesday [3 March].

Samsonov told ITAR-TASS that it was a working visit during which the parties signed a plan of actions for the development of ties between the main commands of the Joint Armed Forces of the CIS and the Korean People's Army.

Asked about military deliveries to North Korea by the CIS, Samsonov said that till 1990 these deliveries were made either gratis or in return for Korean raw materials and goods. "Such deliveries are now made only along the state line in the framework of the conversion of the military-industrial complex and only on a commercial basis," Samsonov said. He said the Korean side has difficulties in repaying the deliveries.

Samsonov also had a meeting with Korean President Kim Il-song who declared during the conversation in favour of the strengthening of friendship and cooperation between the peoples of the CIS and North Korea.

More on DPRK Visit

LD0303230692 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1830 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Report from Pyongyang by correspondent Konstantin Byov]

[Text] The visit to the DPRK by Colonel General Viktor Samsonov, chief of the General Staff of the CIS Joint Armed Forces, has ended.

[Byov] During the high-ranking CIS delegation's stay in Pyongyang, which lasted not much more than 24 hours, a plan of measures for developing relations between the chief commands of the Armed Forces of the two countries was signed. The delegation was received by DPRK President Kim Il-song.

Viktor Samsonov had a conversation with Army General Choe Kwang, chief of the General Staff of the Korean

People's Army, and Vice Marshal O Chin-u, minister of the DPRK People's Armed Forces.

Choe Kwang highly assessed the results of the brief working visit of the CIS military delegation. He stressed that all the set goals have been achieved.

Explaining the content of the document that was signed, General Samsonov said that he envisages exchanges of delegations at various levels, mutual protocol visits of detachments of warships and small air force units, and the deepening of friendly links with the Far East and Trans-Baykal Military Districts of Russia.

Viktor Samsonov asserted that the nuclear problems of the Korean peninsula were not discussed during his conversations in Pyongyang. He stated that deliveries of combat equipment from the CIS for the DPRK Armed Forces have ceased since 1991.

Further Incidents With U.S. Navy Forseen

LD0403130392 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1910 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Military affairs observer Aleksandr Yakovlev commentary]

[Text] The recent collision of two nuclear-powered submarines of the U.S. and Russian navies at the entrance to the Kola Bay of the Barents Sea was not surprising at all, but unless conclusions are drawn, more accidents of this kind may occur. This is the view of our observer on military affairs Aleksandr Yakovlev. This is what he writes:

The navies of the United States and other NATO countries keep being guided by principles of the forward-frontier doctrine. The doctrine provides for actions against the Commonwealth Navy near its bases. The next exercise, codenamed Teamwork '92, will be held from the 6th to the 25th of this month in the north-eastern Atlantic and in the north of Europe. One hundred and seventy warships, 300 aircraft, and ground troops will be involved in the exercise. The number of men taking part has been reduced by 20 percent compared with the peak of the military confrontation between the East and the West. However, the direction of the exercise against Russia is evident. Among the latest preparations for the exercise one can single out stepped up naval surveillance right next to our shores. One resulted in a collision of the Russian and American nuclear-powered submarines at the entrance to the Kola Bay of the Barents Sea.

Professionals in Russia view calmly both the coming exercise and the surveillance by the NATO navy. And here is the opinion of a senior naval specialist on international legal issues, First Rank Captain Vladimir (?Pankov):

Any navy has a chance to plan such operations in peace time, said Capt. Vladimir Pankov. This is no breach of international maritime law. Freedom of sailing is the basis for the activities of navies and merchant fleets. As for the new political (?reality), the United States might review its plans towards our country, which is acting in a new quality today. Unfortunately, we can see none of this by the actions of the navies. The Russian Navy sailors are concerned about a divergance with the United States on how to count the width of the territorial waters of the two countries. The Russian sailors are also concerned about the readiness of the United States Navy to prove it is right by actions. Four years ago on 12th February 1988, this brought about a collision of Soviet and United States' ships in the Black Sea. In 1990 an attempt was made to bring closer together the stands of the two countries on the issue. But the talks that started at first were discontinued. If the talks are not resumed and the problem is not solved there may be more collisions of Russian and United States nuclear-powered ships.

Marshal Meets North Atlantic Assembly Group

LD0303141892 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1304 GMT 3 Mar 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow, 3 Mar (TASS)—A long discussion on issues related to the development of comprehensive interstate cooperation and interaction in the interests of the strengthening of stability and of ensuring lasting peace took place today between Air Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, commander in chief of the CIS Joint Armed Forces, and a delegation of the political council of the North Atlantic Assembly. The delegation is headed by Jan Petersen, the chairman of the subcommittee on issues of eastern Europe and the former USSR. The meetings were conducted in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

Shaposhnikov To Visit Turkey, France

LD0303182192 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1156 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Text] Moscow, 3 Mar (TASS)—As an ITAR-TASS correspondent has discovered from official sources, Air Force Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, commander in chief of the CIS Joint Armed Forces, will make official visits to Turkey (10-14 March) and France (6-10 April).

Woerner, Velayati Trips to CIS Pondered

PM0303150192 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Feb 92 p 2

[Observer Aleksandr Golts article under the "Topic of the Day" rubric: "Which Coordinator Is Next, Please?"]

[Text] It is a pity that diplomacy is not a mass trade. Were it so, the CIS states would now have obtained reliable sources of hard currency, since the whole of the former USSR has now become transformed into a unique proving ground for the training of diplomats by foreign countries. Where else could they learn how to resolve regional conflicts and simultaneously hold talks about the future of nuclear arms, how to allocate emergency humanitarian aid and prepare agreements on a joint scientific center where representatives of the world's scientific elite will work. And, finally, where else can foreign diplomats test their strength in seeking to establish relations between republics which only yesterday called each other "fraternal"?

The fatal inability of the CIS states to establish relations with one another is actually pushing foreign diplomats into the role of coordinators within the CIS. Thus U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, correctly described as the main coordinator, had hardly departed the former Union before NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner replaced him.

It has to be said that he himself and his interlocutors in Moscow and Kiev have resolutely denied that the NATO secretary general has taken on the functions of mediator between Ukraine and Russia. But, you will agree, the very choice of these two republics for the visit speaks for itself. How indeed could there be talk about arms control and strategic stability in Europe without thereby touching upon the differences in the two republics' approaches to the future of the Armed Forces. What Manfred Woerner did not say publicly, CIA Director Robert Gates did lay out pretty clearly to the U.S. Congress. He stressed that Commonwealth members had not as yet settled questions connected with the ratification and implementation of arms control agreements. In so doing Gates directly pointed out the difficulties arising with the implementation of the Paris agreements on conventional arms, since the CIS states have not yet determined which arms they are retaining as part of the quotas set for the former USSR.

These questions did, of course, perturb Woerner too. Thus he expressed the hope that Ukraine and Russia will settle their differences in the military sphere. But he did not confine himself to wishes alone. Woerner—clearly not without design—shifted the emphasis at the talks to discussion of proposed joint work by CIS republics and NATO countries in the North Atlantic Cooperation Council, since the planned political consultations—during which defense policy, collaboration among national armies, and arms reduction will be discussed—should ultimately serve the objectives of coordinating the policy of the former USSR's republics but now under NATO auspices.

It is significant that not only has NATO resolved to attach the CIS republics to its structures and thereby ensure at least some opportunity for influencing what happens in them, but that the states united by the Helsinki process have also undertaken virtually the same. They have agreed that henceforth not just the CIS countries in Europe, but the Asian republics of the former Union too are included in the CSCE. Henceforth, on the political plane, Europe stretches far beyond the Urals. That is why this week the leaders of not just Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova, but also Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan have put their signature to the CSCE Final Act (the leaders of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Turkmenistan will sign the Helsinki document later).

While our Asian republics are thus opening one door to the West, the West itself is receiving guarantees that the principles of the inviolability of borders and observance of human rights will be honored throughout the territory of the former USSR. Incidentally, the new CSCE members are treating their new commitments in a pretty peculiar way—sorry testimony to which is the unremitting bloodshed in Nagorno-Karabakh.

But here too a foreign coordinator has appeared. Tehran has espied an opportunity for itself in the settlement of the Karabakh conflict, where not just Moscow and Alma-Ata but Washington too has suffered a fiasco. Iranian Foreign Minister Velayati has visited Baku and Yerevan, where he put forward a plan to settle the conflict, worked out in his department. The details of the plan are unknown, but the very fact that Velayati was able to get both sides to agree to a provisional truce indicates the seriousness of his intentions. Iran, which has long-standing historical ties with Azerbaijan and Armenia, proved very well-placed for the role of mediator.

Iran is not, of course, motivated solely by the desire to extinguish a center of confrontation on its borders. The image of a disinterested honest broker is precisely what Tehran needs to ensure its own influence in Central Asia. It is no accident, as representatives of the Iranian opposition have reported, that Tehran has already spent $0.5 billion to those ends.

It would seem that the entry of individual republics into the international arena and the unprecedented diplomatic activity regarding the CIS should be a matter for pure joy, as the sounder the ties between CIS states and the outside world are, the more stable the situation in the former USSR will be.

But at the same time something else does surprise: The purely ostentatious reluctance of the CIS states themselves to establish relations within their own very frail commonwealth. Top-level conferences are becoming merely an arena for demonstrating supersovereignty. They end with the drafting of yet more declarations of intent. But no one is about to extinguish centers of conflict, whether they be in Moldavia or South Ossetia.

I fear that we have spent such a long time persuading one another that ties established over centuries cannot be sundered that we have come to believe that these ties will persist if no one strengthens them, that they will persist even when people are constantly trying to break them. And it turns out that it is others who are taking the trouble to strengthen our mutual relations, people who are aware of all the danger of any further disintegration of the former USSR. In the meantime, we move farther and farther apart.

And thus, while observing this unparalleled diplomatic activity on the territory of the former USSR, I want to say: Coordinators, please take your turn. Who is next?

Pentagon Resistance to Military Cuts Reported

PM0303142792 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Mar 92 p 3

[Report by correspondent Vladislav Drobkov: "Pentagon Is Not Retreating But Planning Future Wars in CIS"]

[Excerpts] Washington, 2 Mar—Les Aspin, influential chairman of the U.S. Congress House Armed Services Committee, has earned the Pentagon's dissatisfaction. The military department has accused him of trying to cut back the Pentagon budget for 1993, proceeding from "purely political" considerations which have nothing in common with national defense interests. As Pentagon official spokesman Pete Williams has stated, any plans for a more substantial reduction of the armed forces than envisaged by President George Bush's proposals threaten to harm the troops' combat capability.

The reason for such serious dissatisfaction and alarm on the part of the military department was the publication at the end of last week of Aspin's letter to the chairman of the House Budget Committee planning a reduction to the Pentagon's budget for 1993 of $12-15 billion. Bush's plan provides for a reduction of $7 billion. The Pentagon is asking for $281 billion from the federal budget for the next fiscal year. [passage omitted]

The Pentagon, in fulfilling President Bush's instruction, has prepared a program for reducing the numerical strength of the U.S. Armed Forces to 1.8 million by 1997 compared with 2.1 million during the "cold war." The democrats in Congress suggest making one more substantial reduction—to 1.4 million soldiers and officers. [passage omitted]

As Les Aspin himself has said, even if the numerical strength of the U.S. Armed Forces is reduced to 1.4 million, that is quite enough to conduct military operations far beyond the United States like the "Desert Storm" operation and to repel North Korea's hypothetical invasion of South Korea and to carry out another military action like the invasion of Panama. All this could be done at the same time.

But the Pentagon has no intention of allowing a cutback in appropriations for its needs. It is hurriedly preparing "scenarios" for the wars of the future, including potential conflicts between the republics of the former Soviet Union. All this is designed to justify the need to retain a high level of military readiness by the United States and correspondingly the multibillion appropriations.

But the crisis America is experiencing and the election campaign concentrated on economic subjects are giving the Democrats serious arguments in favor of reducing military expenditure and channeling the funds released into development needs. Their efforts in the majority of cases enjoy voters' support. Particularly if you consider the disappearance of the notorious "Soviet threat" which for decades enabled the Pentagon to build up military preparations and appropriations.

U.S. Aid Viewed; Large-Scale Thefts Denied

PM0403094392 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 2

[Sergey Taranov report: "Humanitarian Aid: Americans Will Give Even More. But Only to the Sick and Hungry"]

[Text] Two An-124 "Ruslans" airlifted 230 tonnes of food from the USAF Rhein-Main air base 26 February—the latest consignment of over 2,500 tonnes of humanitarian aid that have been transported since 10 February via the air bridge "Provide Hope."

Much has already been said and written about "Provide Hope." Some relate to it enthusiastically and with emotion, treating it as if the donated produce from the United States could be the answer to all our food problems. Others are indignant from a sense of outraged national pride: The Americans, they say, are giving away things they do not need themselves. After all, all this pudding, dried soup, and packaged chicken and rice should have been eaten by the Army fighting in the Persian Gulf, but owing to the brevity of the war there was no demand for it.

This latter point is true. But does this mean that produce and medicines that are indeed "not needed" should be automatically given to the poverty-stricken CIS? Just one example: When our "Ruslan" landed at Rhein-Main (which is close to the German city of Frankfurt am Main), the base administration announced that they would pay the expenses of three officials from the Russian delegation—Ella Pamfilova, minister of social protection for the population, and two of her traveling companions. The rest (six journalists) did not get a cent from the base's budget. And it never occurred to anyone to give the reporters the contents of at least one of the tens of thousands of crates and boxes destined for dispatch to Russia. Incidentally, the same thing happened with the bed for the night: A room costs $120 per night. They had to spend the night 200 km away from the base—at the Soviet ambassador's house in Bonn.

"We are primarily giving aid only to sectors of the CIS population that might otherwise be**VERY HUNGRY** or **VERY ILL**," U.S. Ambassador Richard Armitage said in an official press release.

With bookkeeping meticulousness, the Americans are totaling and keeping tabs on everything that is given away free. Colonel Woodhouse, who escorted the Russian journalists around the base, reeled off aid statistics to us from memory. A total of 2,500 tonnes of food, medical technology, and medicines have been transported via the "Provide Hope" air bridge; these have been received by the inhabitants of 24 "separate locations" in 11 CIS countries. These are Yerevan, Bishkek, Baku, Ashkhabad, Minsk, Tashkent, Dushanbe, Chisinau, Kiev, Kharkov, Lvov, Alma-Ata, Semipalatinsk, Moscow, St. Petersburg, Novokuznetsk, Kemerovo, Perm, Yekaterinburg, Chelyabinsk, Arkhangelsk, Ulan-Ude, Chita, and Irkutsk. The USAF C-5 ("Galaxy") and C-141 ("Starlifter") cargo aircraft have flown 364,000 miles from Rhein-Main and from Ankara and Incirlik (Turkey).

"At no time and in no place did we promise that the United States would feed the entire population of the CIS," I was told by Thompson Buchanan, the 68-year-old officer of the reserve who is the main coordinator of "Operation Provide Hope." "By sending food and medicines, Americans are hereby demonstrating their new relationship with Russia and the other Commonwealth states. It is important for us to show the world and each other that we are no longer enemies."

Incidentally, during the war Mr. Buchanan worked in the group that coordinated U.S. lend-lease aid. Today this no-longer-young man has volunteered to help us. According to him, one of the main tasks of "Operation Provide Hope" is to blaze an aid trail not just from the government but also from private and public organizations in America. For four months beginning in March, 17 CIS cities will receive 77,000 tonnes of goods collected by the Armenian Church and the Catholic Society "World Vision." The Association of American Hospitals has received confirmation that its members are prepared to dispatch hundreds of brand medicines and medical equipment to the CIS immediately. In the wake of "Provide Hope," "Operation Northwest Neighbor" will be implemented: Food and medical technology will be delivered to Vladivostok and Khabarovsk from Spokane...

As "donors," of course, they need guarantees against the thieving and embezzlement of aid. Generally speaking, this is the main and practically the only topic of all conversations outside the context of official speeches. On her way back to Moscow, Ella Pamfilova said that whoever she met during these days and nights—when she got practically no sleep or rest—she was obliged to repeat every time that there are no massive thefts of humanitarian aid organized by the "Mafia." The people carrying off the odd box of luncheon meat are the half-starving soldiers who load them and workers at children's and old people's homes who siphon off something for themselves... But to call either one group or the other "prosperous" would be to mock them. In a country where you have to give up one-fifth of your salary for a kilogram of cooked sausage, it is impossible to guarantee the absolute security of donated food. Our American benefactors have basically agreed that this is so.

Commonwealth

'Struggle' To Convene Congress Continues

Umalatova States Case

PM0403101392 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 Mar 92 p 1

[Interview with Sazhi Umalatova, head of organizing committee to prepare for and hold an emergency Sixth Congress of USSR People's Deputies, by N. Garifullina; place and date not given: "To Save the Homeland"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] Many people will probably remember how Sazhi Umalatova literally forced her way onto the rostrum at the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies and demanded President Gorbachev's resignation. She explained her action as follows: "The country is in danger, and it is necessary to defend the country and the people." There was a universal fuss over that statement, and the "democratic" press set about trying to ascertain who had prompted Umalatova to take that action. She herself explained it from the congress rostrum: "...My conscience. My civic conscience. No one else..." In the "600 Seconds" program a few days ago Aleksandr Nevzorov called Umalatova "fearless Sazhi." Today Sazhi Umalatova heads the organizing committee to prepare for and hold an emergency Sixth Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

[Garifullina] Sazhi, together with other USSR people's deputies you are once again taking a bold and unusual action by throwing down a challenge to many political forces and their leaders. Why are you seeking to convene an emergency congress?

[Umalatova] We are mounting a struggle to convene the congress under conditions in which people have not only signed the USSR's death sentence but many have already been in a hurry to bury it and even to wipe it off the political map of the world. Following the rout of Union organs, the Army began to be split up into national compartments, and its property, including modern armaments, began to be seized; while on 23 February, when Muscovites took to the street to speak out in defense of the unity of the Armed Forces and to bow before the motherland's defenders, the "democratic" authorities threw the militia and members of a special-purpose militia detachment against unarmed people ...How can I keep quiet in such a situation?

[Garifullina] Which tasks, specifically, must the congress resolve, in your opinion?

[Umalatova] The congress is the only legal organ representing the country's entire population, and it must exercise its constitutional functions: elect the new Supreme Soviet and government and accept Gorbachev's resignation. The organizing committee recently examined the question of the congress agenda. It is proposed to discuss the situation in the country and measures to prevent a catastrophe. I believe that an emergency congress, convened with the support of a people who have been reduced to despair and of the republics' leaders objectively interested in creating federal organs which enjoy their trust, can play the decisive role in the transition from confrontation to national reconciliation, enshrining this in a corresponding pact.

[Garifullina] Who supports you?

[Umalatova] Signatures were collected as long ago as last December. At that time more than 450 deputies advocated the idea of a congress. We are now getting telephone calls and cables, and dozens of deputies are arriving and offering assistance. There are reports from many republics: We will come in entire delegations. But there is tangible opposition. The organizing committee sent a letter to Russian Supreme Soviet Chairman Khasbulatov, asking him to allocate work premises. He refused, basing this on the fact that the agreement was signed in Minsk 8 December and the Union no longer exists. But the state was not created by three people, and three people cannot dissolve it! Of course, things are difficult without premises. We have taken a single room in the Moskva Hotel, and we have to fight for an extension every two or three days. Still we will convene the congress!

[Garifullina] Where do you intend to hold it?

[Umalatova] We have sent a letter to B. Yeltsin and R. Khasbulatov, asking them to make the Palace of Congresses available. Of course, some people maintain that we have no right to hold the congress. That is wrong. The congress has not liquidated itself as an organ of power, and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolution disbanding the USSR Supreme Soviet was illegal. It was stated at the last Union congress that an emergency congress may be convened in emergency conditions. We are now in an emergency situation. But we do not make it our aim to revive the old Union. We want to restore legality and on 17 March confirm the people's will, expressed in the all-Union referendum a year ago, and in this we hope for the support of both deputies and voters.

[Garifullina] To judge from readers' letters, you have many supporters.

Many offer assistance, including financial assistance....

[Umalatova] I want to thank all comrades for their assistance. Patriotically minded citizens, labor collectives, political organizations, parties, and movements—in short, all who are concerned about the fate of the country and the people—may send money for the congress fund to the following accounts:

Moscow, sort code 201735, Perovskiy branch of the Moscow Stock Exchange Bank, current account No. 700915, "Russia Public Center" (Congress);

Moscow, the "Civil Accord" OPS [expansion unknown] (Congress), current account No. 700024 at the Conversion Bank, correspondent account no. 161312 of the Russian Central Bureau, sort code 299112.

Money may also be transferred directly to USSR People's Deputy Anatoliy Makarovich Kryshkin at this address: Moskva Hotel, 7 Okhotnyy Ryad, Moscow 103159.

Our contact telephone number is 292-12-05.

Congress To Be Legally Powerless

LD0303172692 Moscow TASS in English 1648 GMT 3 Mar 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Tamara Zamyatina and Aleksandr Krasulin]

[Text] Moscow March 3 TASS—A group of former people's deputies of the former Soviet Union have not given up their intention of convening a congress.

Congress organizers told reporters here today they hope to use the forum to create a coordinating body capable of "building a powerful and prosperous multi-national state", which, in the words of former USSR people's deputy Yuriy Golik will "have nothing to do with the old archaic structure of the Union."

The former deputy did not outline the specifics of the new structure.

The Council of Republics of the former USSR Supreme Soviet ceased to exist last fall when the Russian and Belarussian delegations were recalled and the necessary quorum could not be ensured.

It is now unclear how many former deputies will support the congress. Member of the organizational committee Aleksandr Kraiko said he is not sure they will manage to secure a quorum.

Sources at the State and Legal Department of the Russian president told ITAR-TASS the Congress of USSR People's Deputies ceased to exist since constitutional norms establishing its status and authority lost their power.

The Council of Republics of the USSR Supreme Soviet stated in a declaration in connection with the creation of the Commonwealth of Independent States of December 26, 1991, the Soviet Union, as a state and subject of international law, has ceased to exist.

The so-called Congress of USSR People's Deputies from the legal point of view is an assembly of former USSR people's deputies and, in this capacity, cannot make decisions on behalf of any state.

Could Lead to 'War of Governments'

OW0403120892 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1053 GMT 4 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Sergey Alekseyev, ex-head of the Constitutional Supervision Committee of the former Soviet Union, has said the attempt of a group of activists led by Sazhi Umalatova to convene an extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies later this month may lead to "a war of governments." He believes that in legal terms the activity of former government bodies is entirely a matter of the past, and that the ex-Soviet republics should "begin a new process of integration, instead of trying to reverse national development."

Alekseyev's views are shared by Sergey Shakhray, Vice Premier of the Russian Government and state adviser on legal matters, who regards the attempt to call an extraordinary congress as anticonstitutional. Since the congress was dissolved last September, the planned gathering of deputies will not be empowered to decide such matters as the former state's restoration.

Irina Andreyeva, ex-USSR People's Deputy, has reproached the congress organizers for "lack of flexibility" during the August coup that resulted in their failure to convene even a session of the Supreme Soviet, let alone a Congress of People's Deputies. Today, Andreyeva said, the activists led by Umalatova "are only seeking to support the populist movement of 'empty pans'."

Need for 'New Center' Discussed

OW0303162992 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1557 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Sixth Special Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR will be held under any circumstances, the chairman of the congress' organizing committee Sazhi Umalatova said at a news conference on Tuesday [3 March]. "There is no reviving the old Union, and the objective of the congress is to set up a body around which the republics, regions and districts of the former Soviet Union will unite on a new basis".

The congress is to be convened at the initiative of a group of People's Deputies of the USSR who intend to open it on March 17 to mark the first anniversary of an all-Union referendum at which the majority voted for the retention of the Soviet Union.

Nikolay Ryzhkov, the former prime minster of the USSR stressed that "the emergence of sovereign states in the territory of the former Soviet Union cannot be ignored, but they will not survive without a new center which would balance their interests". The Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), in Ryzhkov's view, is "a stillborn child born during the night". Constituent documents of the CIS are not binding for anybody, while customs barriers raised at the republics' borders will kill the single economic organism, he said.

Ryzhkov pointed out that it was not political ambitions that prompted him to take part in the preparations for the congress but the convictions of a citizen confident that the current developments were pushing the country closer to an abyss.

When asked about former President Gorbachev's attitude to the congress idea, Ryzhkov said he did not maintain any contacts with the former leader of the USSR. According to Ryzhkov he last saw Gorbachev on May 1, 1991.

Sazhi Umalatova said that Gorbachev would not be invited to the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR, adding that the congress would approve his resignation as president "in any event".

People's Deputy Yuriy Golik insisted that the idea to convene the congress was supported by opposition parties, including entrepreneurs and state economic bodies which need a single state".

Retired General Albert Makashov said "today almost one thousand of People's Deputies of the USSR (with a total of 2,225—IF [INTERFAX]) agreed to attend the special congress. It will consider expelling People's Deputies who would not come to the forum".

"Abolishing the Congress of People's Deputies is just as hard as abolishing the Soviet people", People's Deputy Aleksandr Kraiko said adding that "today we must save the people from starvation, and reforms will have to be carried out later".

Kraiko said in an IF interview that "the emergency in this country could only be overcome by using firm command and administrative methods". According to Kraiko, the Russian or Moscow authorities (he declined to say precisely whose) plan to make use of repressive steps against the People's Deputies of the USSR to prevent them from convening the congress.

Kraiko was not sure whether the forthcoming congress would bring together a sufficient number of deputies to make the quorum, but "it will be convened anyway". He stressed, however, that decisions that might be taken by the congress would be of advisory and not of binding nature.

Agenda Set for Heads of Government Meeting

LD0303235192 Moscow TASS in English 1256 GMT 3 Mar 92

[By BELTA correspondent Vladimir Glod]

[Text] Minsk March 3 TASS—The 18 items to be discussed by the coming meeting of heads of government of states of the Commonwealth of Independent States will include the items: "Guarantees of citizens rights for pensions, "coordinated tax policy, "principles of customs policy". BELTA was told this on Tuesday [3 March] by Ivan Korotchenya, coordinator of the working group for organisational-technical preparation and holding of a meeting of the Council of Heads of State and the Council of Heads of Government. The meeting will be held on March 13 in Moscow. The working group is now drawing up the necessary documents.

Materials are also being prepared for a meeting of Heads of State of the Commonwealth to be held in Kiev on March 20. A set of military problems will be in the focus of attention in the Ukrainian capital, Korotchenya said.

Military

Withdrawal From Baltics 'Complex and Difficult'

LD0103131892 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1311 GMT 23 Feb 92

[Interview with Colonel General Valeriy Mironov, commander of the Northwestern Group of Forces, by correspondent Valentina Bochkova in Riga on 23 February; from the "Authors' Channel in the First Person" program—recorded]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Bochkova] Just like you, thousands of officers and soldiers have served. Now, the destinies of many soldiers here in the Baltic republics are being ruined. The first round of intergovernmental talks has taken place. Have relations stabilized perhaps between the Soviet Army, the former Soviet Army, which is customarily called an occupation army here, and the local authorities, so to speak customs officers, etc? How do you look at the situation which has now came about, at least in our Latvia?

[Mironov] I think that outwardly all this—the interrelations—has remained at the same level. But the analysis of the entire situation which is taking place, in this case in the Latvian Republic, is nevertheless putting me on my guard that it gradually has a tendency towards worsening. This may not be very correct on my part, but increasingly it is not the voice of reasonable politicians that is prevailing but the voice of nationalist positions, including in the press. This is also true of the debates which are taking place in the Supreme Soviet. It is not necessary to be or to have some intelligence service, there are officially printed publications. We analyze them and they put us on guard.

[Bochkova] After each program of ours which touches either upon questions of the work of the customs department or questions of social security, we receive very many calls from servicemen. What is to be done? How do you see all these problems inasmuch as you are now the commander of the Northwestern Group of Forces? How do you yourself see the future of those who so far are subordinate to you and the future of those who have already completed their service?

[Mironov] You have asked a question which one could take days to answer, or at least not answer, but take issue on. It is very complicated in its structure and as regards the subquestions which lie behind it. I will say only one thing: Just like any other person, a commander is also a person and he expects responsible political solutions from both the leaders of the Russian Federation and the leaders of each of the three Baltic republics. But this does not at all mean that we are just sitting here waiting. Of course a whole set of measures is being carried out by the command of the group which is aimed at—prior to the achievement of such agreements, treaties—somehow alleviating some negative processes which are taking place now.

[Bochkova] How is this being done?

[Mironov] Both through personal contacts of the commander and his deputies and assistants with a whole range of leaders of some republic, and through precise reactions to any rumors which, from our position are assessed negatively, encroach on the rights not only of servicemen and the members of their families, but also of blue-collar and white-collar workers, pensioners of the Defense Ministry.

At the end of the day we worked out a whole package of those, well, not demands, but proposals which we, with our vision, placed in the overall complex of problems which have to be resolved during the talks. There are also rather material things. For example—although we are much abused for this, but that is their business and we regard it as our right and duty—it is not just that we are now engaged in tackling matters connected with the social protection of people including making housing available to our people, and here I have in mind that which we get from the sale of military technical properties. It is of course possible to judge in a variety of ways whether we succeeded a lot or a little in doing this, but I think that thanks to (?activity) we succeeded in fulfilling the 1991 building program.

We have already succeeded in purchasing a few things—this is no longer calculated in single units or dozens, but hundreds of apartments on the territory of the Russian Federation for officers and ensigns going into the reserve or retirement. I think this activity will spread.

[Bochkova] Valeriy Ivanovich, will this activity affect people? This is a question which was posed to me today over the telephone—before running over here I was able to reply to a number of telephone calls—do you think of the fate of servicemen who are already in the reserve and who, perhaps as a result of some moral considerations, would not want to remain here on the territory of the Latvian Republic despite the fact that they have apartments. However, I understand there is a question mark over these apartments too.

[Mironov] This is a very sore subject in human terms, but at the same time it is necessary to understand that given all our involvement in tackling this problem one must not adopt the approach that it is only military people who should resolve it. This should be a state program. It is just that we cannot manage it. Today, for example, I cited the figures that if today we have somewhere around 10,000 troops in the group as a whole without housing—and that does not relate to the Baltic Fleet, if today the officers and administrative staff whose apartments have become official ones are deprived of this space, then this will already be somewhere of the order of 30,000-35,000. If one adds to this those who are in reserve, it is an impossible task.

The other question: Inasmuch as this is possible for us—conducting this commercial activity, as people are now calling it, although we are not commercial people—then of course we shall and are taking account of the interests of the pensioners of the Ministry of Defense, various favorable terms for the sale of military and technical property, and equipment. Thus people should be able, if only at the outset, to get on their feet to fulfill their goals. But I say again, and I am convinced of this, that this should be a quite clearly defined state program.

[Bochkova] Valeriy Ivanovich, you say a clearly defined state program. Do you think this should be a mutual program presented by the Russian side and the Latvian side or do you think that one side should work out such a program and get on with implementing it?

[Mironov] I think that the two sides should tackle this. For example, to strike a pose and say that everything is ours, I regard this as wrong. Views are being built on the wrong principles. If one speaks of evacuating—I have no fear of this word—a former military person, then this evacuation must be compensated. At whose expense? If this accommodation was built at the expense of Ministry of Defense, then let's talk in a human, civilized way. We shall hand over this accommodation, but in exchange build on the territory of the Russian Federation.

[Bochkova] Excuse me, Valeriy Ivanovich, but on precisely this topic during the first stage of these interstate talks... excuse me, I am changing subjects because we were speaking with Deputy Dobelis. He actually attended this special commission and he said that because Latvia has experience of construction in Tyumen Oblast they are able to help the builders. Was this just his personal idea?

[Mironov] Yes, the issue has been raised. It has to be properly understood that (?so far there has been no elaboration of specific agreements or decisions). As you know, the delegations did not sign any treaties or agreements but only communiques. This is just de facto the start of talks, nothing more. These issues were mentioned but here perhaps, as far as I understand the Latvian side in this case, and the words of Mr. Dobelis, the Latvian side is now posing the question differently: that using our forces we agree to help construction on the territory of Russia for Russian money. This, in my view, is a quite different formulation of the issue.

[Bochkova] Valeriy Ivanovich, you are saying that for the time being there is nothing concrete in these talks.

From the start there was the first stage of talks set for the end of February and this has now evidently been shifted slightly to the start of March, but how do you perhaps perceive, apart from the fact that you presumably have intuition and are a pretty experienced person, how do you perceive when this concrete element may appear?

[Mironov] It is very difficult to respond to this question in concrete terms, and I will say only that after the talks mentioned earlier, an expert group in Vilnius—there were experts from the Russian and Lithuanian sides—worked with us for a whole week. Our side was headed by special envoy Issakov. There were no big results from the work of experts. For this reason I think that all these talks will be very complex and difficult.

[Bochkova] Yes, I sensed that, because you are nevertheless proposing that the withdrawal, the optimum timescale for withdrawal, is about five years, right: The same Yuris Dobelis speaks of two years. Do you think that is too quick?

[Mironov] Each side has to justify in full the principles based on the realities. It is necessary. After all, I understand the arguments of Mr. Dobelis [words indistinct]. To have declared as property all military equipment, weapons, military property, moveable and immoveable and so on, it is possible to ask the question—undress all these Russian muzhiks or cowards—probably one ought not to speak like that on the radio, build and let them walk off. A private will reach the border in just 24 or 48 hours and once he has crossed it, the withdrawal has been effected.

But that is not how things will be. Not like that. We have no intention, no intention of loading up people into convoys and driving them off into uncertainty. When all these questions are resolved in a civilized manner—it is true that I am bored with this word, of speaking about civilization against a background of uncivilized actions—when all these questions are resolved at the level of delegations, at the level of governments, and signed, each side will accurately fulfill these agreements which have been reached and then the true process of withdrawing the troops will get under way. [passage omitted]

Fate of Air Defense Forces Considered

PM0403103592 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Mar 92 p 1

[Report by Major A. Ivanov: "Troop Withdrawal From Baltic. It Would Be Good To Avoid Any Fuss or Mistakes"]

[Text] The beginning of the withdrawal of former Union troops from Baltic territory is a political event that has attracted the attention of diplomats, the military, and the press. On 25 February a number of newspapers and the television, in an attempt to keep their finger on the pulse of the times, published and aired items on how the men of a surface-to-air missile battalion in the small town of Mickunai near Vilnius were preparing for redeployment.

"Unfortunately," this correspondent was told by Major General of Aviation Ye. Makoklyuyev, first deputy chief of the Air Defense Forces Main Staff, "the news of the first phase of the missile troops' withdrawal was not sufficiently objective in all the mass media. For instance, the television showed a column of military equipment ready to roll, commenting that the withdrawal timetable had been postponed and allegedly the military was to blame.

"Nothing of the sort actually happened," the general stressed. "Under the agreement between the Russian Federation and Lithuania it was decided to withdraw the surface-to-air missile battalion commanded by Lieutenant Colonel A. Ryzhkov in three phases. The commission to evaluate buildings, installations, and the environmental situation began work 25 February—and corresponding documents have been drawn up. As planned, all the battalion's materiel was moved 28 February and withdrawn to the brigade directorate so as to be readied for moving out. And, finally, the subunit will actually withdraw 3 March. After a rally the missile troops will proceed to their new posting in Opochka, Pskov Oblast."

But 14 officer and warrant officer families still remain at the former site. The battalion's fate has not yet been sealed, so the women and children will have to wait a little longer for a transfer.

Ensuring that the troops have everything they need in their new location, and providing social protection for servicemen is the most acute issue today. The Air Defense Troops Main Staff has reported that the timetable for the withdrawal of air defense units from the Baltic countries will largely depend on the specific solutions to these problems. The command has made realistic calculations of its abilities and funds so as to ensure that there is no repetition of what happened when our troops hastily left East Europe and were moved into tents and huts in their homeland. At any rate, as has already been stressed, there is no prospect of this for the more than 20,000 servicemen at air defense units in the Baltic.

Aviation Pilots on Social Protection Issues

PM0303124192 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1500 GMT 28 Feb 92

[Report by I. Parfenenko and A. Zhyk; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] [Parfenenko] This is one of the military garrisons near Minsk. It is here that long-range aviation pilots and air defense pilots do their military service. The officers have assembled in the military club to discuss a new law—the "Law on the Social Protection of Servicemen."

[S.V. Gaidukevich, deputy chairman of the Republic Fund for the Special Protection of Servicemen] Tens of thousands of servicemen hope to acquire a status for themselves from this law as well as social protection, not just for themselves but for the members of their families too.

[Parfenenko] The draft document clearly states that any soldier, irrespective of nationality and regardless of whether the officer or warrant officer takes the oath of allegiance to Belarus or whether he serves on a contract basis, that soldier and his family will be placed under the reliable protection of the law. But the law has not been adopted yet, and servicemen still have many problems.

[V.D. Podtykalov, garrison chief] Today young lieutenants are submitting formal requests to leave the Army purely because they have nothing—they do not have enough resources or money to pay for their apartments. In Minsk it costs 1,000 rubles for a one-room apartment.

Servicemen Criticize Armed Forces Leadership

OW0303171592 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1557 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The current leadership of the CIS United Armed Forces [UAF] is not capable of bringing democracy to the army, according to an open letter circulated in Moscow Tuesday [3 March] from the Independent Union of Servicemen to the commander of the UAF Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov.

The leaders of the union said "the fight for democracy in the Armed Forces is just an empty phrase, the actions of the command not only do not facilitate improvements of the Army and Navy, they prevent democratic processes in the military setting".

The union was especially dissatisfied by the appointment of former heads of military-political bodies to lead the new structures in personnel matters.

The Union also said that the UAF's information policy is determined by Lieutenant General Valeriy Manilov "who supported and justified the anticonstitutional revolt during the coup". At the same time the head of the general headquarters of the Armed Forces General Vladimir Lobov was removed from his post, although, the Union feels he has a clear concept of military reform.

The letter states that a meeting of the representatives of the union with Marshal Shaposhnikov would help to solve the Army's problems.

Military Property To Be Defended 'By Force'

OW0303191592 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1831 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The council of the Northwestern Military Group officers said that any attempts to seize the Army's property by force would be stopped by any means, including the use of weapons. The statement issued by the council stresses that "lately, the Baltic republics have seen repeated attempts to seize real estate and movable property of the Northwestern Military Group and the Baltic Border District".

The officers insist that until the army property is officially divided between Russia and the Baltic states, territories of military units are an "indivisible part of the Russian Federation". They warned that should any army facilities be attacked, all responsibility would be born by the governments of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia.

Speaking at a news conference in Riga on March 2, first deputy commander of the Northwestern Military Group Feodor Melvichuk flatly denied allegations that the military sold weapons to the Caucasus. At the same time, he added that the government of Lithuania asked the group's command to sell it several dozens thousands of automatic rifles. According to the deputy commander, the request is now under consideration.

Media

CIS-Wide Broadcasting Company Proposed

LD0303220192 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Text] Yegor Yakovlev, chairman of the Ostankino State Television and Radio Company, has sent a message to the heads of state of the CIS countries in which he proposed that on the basis of the company headed by him, an international broadcasting company be set up of which the CIS states would become the founders.

According to Yegor Yakovlev's proposal an observation council made up of representatives of the independent states should lead such a company.

The setting up of the company could be combined with the founding of a Eurasian broadcasting union which would be made up of the national broadcasting organisations of the independent states, Yegor Yakovlev's letter says.

Papers' Financial Situation Remains 'Uncertain'

PM0303090692 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 3 Mar 92 p 4

[Unattributed, untitled announcement]

[Text] Unfortunately, the financial situation which the majority of newspapers face remains uncertain. In the next few issues we will try to explain to readers what is happening. But for the time being we are forced to economize.

The next issue of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA will come out on Thursday, 5 March.

TASS Carries Press Review for 4 Mar

LD0403062492 Moscow TASS in English 0459 GMT 4 Mar 92

["Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow March 4 TASS—The newspaper NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA described as a scandal the decision by the Commonwealth states' leaders to return all arts and historic values to the "republic of their origin."

The army newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA publishes an interview with Igor Kasatonov, commander of the Black Sea Fleet.

The Black Sea Fleet is an integral part of the Commonwealth Navy forces and all decision concerning the fleet should be made only by the Commonwealth leaders, Kasatonov said.

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA publishes an article about the "gas war" between Ukraine and Turkmenistan.

In retaliation to Turkmenistan's decision to stop supplying gas to Ukraine, the republic "blocked Turkmen gas supplies abroad via the gas maine on its territory."

The newspaper believes Russia could act as a mediator in this conflict.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA carries reports about the situation in Dubossary (a city in the Dnestr republic of Moldova) after recent clashes between Moldovan police and Dnestr republic militants.

The newspaper said several people were killed during an attack against a motorised rifle regiment near Dubossary on March 2.

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA reports about a meeting between representatives of Georgian and North Ossetian law enforcement bodies in Vladikavkaz, administrative centre of North Ossetia, to discuss terms of talks between Georgia and South Ossetia.

The newspaper also publishes an article by Aleksey Arbatov, director of the Centre for Disarmament and Strategic Stability, in which he comments on Russia's initiative to create a Russian-U.S. joint global anti-missile defence system.

International Affairs

Bush Cited on Yeltsin's Jun Washington Visit

LD0303165192 Moscow TASS in English 1611 GMT 3 Mar 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Andrey Fedyashin]

[Text] Washington, March 3 TASS—The state visit of Russian President Boris Yeltsin to Washington will take place on June 16-17, U.S. President George Bush announced here on Tuesday [3 March] before leaving Washington for Chicago.

Yeltsin was invited to visit Washington during his meeting with Bush in Camp David in February.

Bush said he views the upcoming visit as a nice possibility to continue what was initiated on February 1 in Camp David. Both presidents approved on that day the declaration on the principles of U.S.-Russian relations which envisages that the two countries no longer view "each other as potential enemies."

The U.S. President said he plans to discuss with Boris Yeltsin a wide range of problems, including bilateral relations, nuclear and military issues and joint efforts in promoting Russian economic reforms. Bush added he would have a possibility to express once again his respect to the Russian president who was doing an excellent job.

The upcoming state visit will be the fifth meeting between Boris Yeltsin and George Bush.

Kozyrev, Baker Hold Telephone Conversation

LD0403095292 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0900 GMT 4 Mar 92

[Text] Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev has had a telephone conversation with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker. ITAR-TASS reports that the head of the Russian foreign policy department informed his American colleague about the main results of his trip to Africa. Andrey Kozyrev and James Baker also discussed current issues in Russian-American relations, first and foremost those concerning preparations for Boris Yeltsin's visit to the United States. It was also established that stepping up cooperation in the economic field and also dismantling nuclear arsenals will be discussed at the meeting between the ministers in Brussels on 11 March. James Baker confirmed that the U.S. Administration supports the Russian leadership's line toward reforms and is willing to give it necessary help.

Intelligence Service To Cut Network in U.S.

OW0303143092 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1342 GMT 3 Mar 92

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature; by diplomatic correspondent M. Mayorov; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] As DP's ["Diplomatic Panorama"] correspondent learned from the press bureau of the Russian Intelligence Service (RIS), Russia is planning to cut its intelligence network in the U.S. and other Western countries. The number of intelligence agents in the U.S. will be brought to the level of "reasonable sufficiency," said Tatiana Samolis, member of the RIS press bureau. This decision was prompted by the end to the cold war, by the changing nature of relations between Russia and the U.S., and by growing cooperation between them. "Even though intelligence services monitor each other," there is no need for "zero option game," when they aimed to cause material damage to their adversary, by means of intelligence work too, said T. Samolis. Russia, she said, relies on reciprocity in this matter, even though "it's necessary to analyse yet how this will happen in reality." According to her, mindful of the current situation in this country, the U.S. is not likely to cut the number of its intelligence agents in Russia. What is likely to be cut is American satellite spying, said the member of the RIS press bureau.

U.S. Official on Long Term Aid Programs

LD0303234592 Moscow TASS in English 1925 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Text] Moscow, March 3 TASS—Sergey Filatov, the first deputy chairman of the Russian parliament, received Priscilla Clapp, assistant deputy of U.S. Secretary of State on Refugees in Moscow today, according to the Russian Supreme Soviet press center.

Clapp said that long-term international aid programmes to refugees in the Russian Federation are now being developed by some organisations, including the international organisation on migration.

The representative of the U.S. State Department informed Filatov of the results of the consultations held with a number of European governments which expressed their wish to promote the settlement of problems of refugees in the Commonwealth, and of the readiness of the Red Cross to open its representations in North and South Ossetia, Chechen-Ingush and Nagorno-Karabakh with the aim of rendering humanitarian aid to displaced persons.

Tatarstan Vice President Ends U.S. Visit

OW0103162892 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1331 GMT 1 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Vice-President Vasiliy Likhachev of Tatarstan finished his official visit to the United States where he held talks with U.S. officials and representatives of the business community. The two sides agreed to open a trade mission and a commercial center of Tatarstan in Florida, and an American trade center in Kazan, IF's [INTERFAX's] correspondent reports. They afreed to start negotiating a treaty on economic, cultural, scientific and technological cooperation between the state of Florida and the Republic of Tatarstan.

In New York, Likachev met Professor Tabi, the leader of the Tatar community in the United States. They exchanged views on the intensification of contacts between citizens of the United States and Tatarstan. Professor Tabi was invited to attend the World Tatar Congress scheduled to be held in Kzizan in June.

Satisfied With Visit

OW0403123292 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1053 GMT 4 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Vice-President of Tatarstan, Vasiliy Likhachev, has expressed satisfaction with the results of his recent visit to the United States. He told journalists in Kazan on Tuesday [3 March] that apart from exploring the opportunities for establishing economic and political cooperation, he had tried to restore contacts with the diaspora. Refkat Tabi, coordinator of the U.S.-based Tatar diaspora (uniting 15,000 Tatars), had expressed readiness to help Tatarstan both economically and politically, i.e., to facilitate the republic's recognition by the international community. Tabi voiced the diaspora's extremely negative attitude to attempts by the Milli-Medjlis to press for UN membership for Tatarstan. The American side also requested first-hand information about the Tatar republic's pro-sovereignty efforts and relationships with Russia. According to Likhachev, the U.S.-based Tatars are viewing Tatarstan's "civilized" course towards state sovereignty as a democratic way of development.

Kozyrev Interviewed on Foreign Policy Issues

LD0403032492 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1855 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Interview with Russian Federation Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev by panel of nine newspaper correspondents on the "Without Retouching" program; moderated by Vladimir Tsvetov and Tatyana Krasnova—live]

[Excerpts] [Tsvetov] Hello, respected viewers and dear guests. In the press center of Russian Television's Respublika creative association today is Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Vladimirovich Kozyrev. Representatives of nine newspapers are here to ask him questions. Their names are marked, so you will be able to identify them. I, Vladimir Tsvetov, will be chairing the program.

Russian Television believes in the principle that freedom is the right to do anything permitted by the laws. Our program also has its rules. My assistant, program editor Tatyana Krasnova, will acquaint you with these rules.

[Krasnova] Hello. Let me remind you of the rules of our program, with which you will no doubt already be familiar. Andrey Vladimirovich Kozyrev, our guest on the program, has five minutes to make a statement. He can make it either at the beginning or the end of the program, as he chooses. [passage omitted]

[Ostalskiy] Andrey Ostalskiy, from IZVESTIYA. The legal succession matter arises. Russia has indeed become the legal successor of the USSR. This is an astonishingly interesting exceptional case for international lawyers. It is generally a very interesting issue. But I am interested in this angle: What happened to those USSR treaties and international obligations which were dictated by ideological conceptions? Is Russia taking upon itself the obligations which derive from these treaties and how is this problem to be resolved?

[Kozyrev] The question is indeed a very interesting one. Perhaps there is no exception here because a more accurate expression is the continuer—Russia acts not as the legal successor state, especially a monopolistic legal sucessor, because the legal successor is in fact all the states of the former Soviet Union—but the continuer state is the state which as it were automatically occupies the place of the former state, and in this sense we of course inherit the whole sum of international obligations of the former Union. This is also our advantage. Thanks to this we have not been seeking to join the United Nations. Thanks to this we, as the continuer state, have occupied the seat in the Security Council and so forth.

But it is quite correct that along with this comes not only advantages but also agreements with former ideological allies and a number of other things. Incidentally, people often forget that the declaration of 1956 signed and ratified by the USSR and Japan is also part of the inheritance, which is obligatory for recognition, because we simply have nothing else out of the legacy of the Soviet Union. But you know, for the time being, as far as the ideological treaties are concerned we have decided to work on the policy. Later, we will have a look at treaties. Not all treaties are operating in full, as is known. So, I think that it would be incorrect to start immediately to review these treaties. But we are already adjusting the policy.

[Tsvetov] Right. MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, introduce yourself please.

[Pushkov] Aleksey Pushkov, from the newspaper MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI. I have the following question. The Russian leadership has proclaimed a strategic course toward alliance with the West. But, in general, alliance relations presuppose a certain equality of the sides. At present Russia is clearly in an unfavorable situation. Taking account of our economic position, the fact that we are being fed with food products, and all these air bridges, etc., we may evidently play the role of junior partner in the alliance in question. Do you think that this is the role in store for her there? If yes, or if no, then what may be the role of Russia in such an alliance with the West? Will such overly-close relations with the West not have a negative effect on our relations with such major Asian powers as, say, China or India?

[Kozyrev] For a start, you know, the West is a rather broad concept. For instance, the West incudes Belgium and the Netherlands. I do not think we will lose out by comparison with these states and end up playing the part of some kind of weak or junior partner. So I always act on the assumption that Russia is fated to be a great power by virtue of the size of its territory and its labor and other resources. If you take a look at our partners, they are great to differing degrees. The issue is not who is in what economic position at this precise moment. Incidentally, there is also an economic recession in the United States.

In some countries, the economic situation is better. But that does not mean that there are second-class and first-class partners. I think that the gist of our policy is that we are beginning to share, we have set a course towards genuinely sharing, the values of the civilized world and to live according to these values. That is the essence of our policy. And I think that in that sense we will be fully equal partners. By the way, the states of the so-called West, which pursue these civilized principles of democracy and human rights include Australia, for instance. That is also the West from this point of view. There is also New Zealand. They have not lost their national or geographical identity.

The same applies to us. We will develop our own specific and particular national identity as we follow this road. But totalitarianism negated it and we all know it. Russia itself did not exist at all on the political map, and there was the ideologized concept of the Soviet Union.

On the second part of your question, having entered this community, we will not be opposing anyone who pursues and shares these values. And I think that our neighbors are going to be our allies to the extent that they are willing to share these values.

[Tsvetov] KRASNAYA ZVEZDA next. Please do not forget to introduce yourself.

[Golts] Aleksandr Golts. [passage omitted] When Bush was putting forward his disarmament intiatives, he said they would save $50 billion in five years. There are arguments over this in America at the moment. Some say $100 billion could be saved, others say $150 billion. We cannot say that in Russia. We do not know how much we will save or spend on the disarmament initiatives. While understanding the full importance of these initiatives and the military and political need for them, we can only guess at what the cost will be. I have a very specific question. Before they were tabled, was the potential economic result worked out? If so, could you give us some figures? What is it going to be in the end—a peace dividend or a peace liability?

[Kozyrev] First, I should like to take up that idea of control. Several years ago I spoke in favor, and publicly moreover when it was not particularly fashionable, of parliament—still the union parliament at that time and the Russian parliament today—finally taking control of the budget, the military budget too, down to the fine details. Incidentally, in America, parliament is presented with a military budget in the form of a volume of this size [gestures with hand to represent thick volume] and several more volumes go with it. And no one has lost sight of the strategic priority, as it were. On the contrary, they know just how much armaments and each program costs and are therefore able to answer the question, even though here, too, there is a great deal of conjecturing. With all respect for the president, you can understand yourselves that you can make your calculations in current prices or future prices and generally a hypothetical economy is something almost like the CPSU programs used to be, you know: what will be happening in 1980.

[Golts] Has there been an calculation of any kind?

[Kozyrev] Our calculation was, to be honest, basically something different. It consisted of what the dividend would be from the plan for security parity and the plan for us not to waste our efforts and funds, as it were, on inconceivable and unnecessary objectives at a time when we are becoming their friends and partners precisely because we share common values and there is nothing to divide us. That is where we placed the emphasis. The economic calculation I would say is fairly obvious. Of course, there will be savings and a stop to unnecessary military spending. However, I do not think even a serious economist would undertake to calculate—and I should not like to myself—in figures of any kind. It is obvious that there will be a dividend. Incidentally, conversion initially requires investment of money and so it is a very complicated calculation.

[Golts] It has just become apparent that eliminating tactical nuclear weapons costs quite a bit.

[Kozyrev] Exactly. That is what I am talking about, and so there will be an element of tension in any calculation of this sort. [passage omitted]

[Tsvetov] Now for KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA.

[Chitnik] Maksim Chitnik, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. Andrey Vladimirovich, your American colleague pays rather regular visits to the countries of the Commonwealth and is trying to resolve both his own affairs and even our affairs, and moreover, not unsuccessfully.

Tell us please, are you not jealous of Secretary of State Baker and does it not seem to you that Russia is beginning to lose the bridgehead on which it stands, and those immediately around it?

[Kozyrev] Well, you know, I am not jealous of the secretary of state. The fact that they are resolving their own problems is a quite normal and legitimate thing. Well, what do we want? That they resolve just our problems. Their problems consist of the fact that diplomatic relations need to be established, ambassadors need to be sent, a new policy needs to be defined. What is there to be done? And do we want that? I, for instance, do not.

Our leadership of Russia, strictly speaking, would not want that either. But the union does not exist, so these are independent states, and it is natural that the secretary of state is establishing relations with them. The second aspect is that, so far, I do not have any evidence that these American interests, and, as you say, that it is furthering its own interests to the detriment of Russia. On the contrary, perhaps, I have the feeling—because I have very close contact with the secretary of state, for example today I never made the opening of the Gorbachev Fund because I was speaking with the secretary of state—it is not so easy to get in touch, you need time and so on—so we are in telephone contact almost every day—on the contrary, I have the feeling that at present they are doing very precise work and that in general they are helping to involve all our republics, say, in the pan-European CSCE process.

But we are interested in involving these republics in civilized international relations. So I have no jealousy. I think that work is under way, but we will probably have our own points of emphasis and we are setting them out in the sense that in order—the second part of your question—that it should be completely guaranteed, we are making sure that our Russian interests are observed in this space, and generally, these are that it should be civilized and, I think that they are that first and foremost that our compatriots, human rights, and the rights of ethnic minorities should be defended—we will be raising this very strongly, very strongly, with full respect to our CIS partners. I think that in this we will also rely on the help of civilized countries of the West, which share these principles of human rights. [passage omitted]

[Tsvetov] LITERATURNAYA GAZETA next.

[Simonov] Thank you. Boris Simonov, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. Andrey Vladimirovich, I think I am going to go against the general tone of our discussion. Let me go back to diplomacy as a continuation of policy, whatever the means employed. Russia has had a fairly busy debut on the foreign policy arena. I have in mind disarmament initiatives above all. But I get the impression that the West, and in particular the United States, are doing all they can to moderate our ardor for disarmament, so to speak. For instance, the proposals for a radical cut in nuclear warheads has not been supported by the United States to date. The well-nigh sensational proposal of the Russian president that Russia would no longer target its missiles on American cities also failed to fire Baker's enthusiasm. He said it was a technical matter and it was not difficult to retarget the missiles again. What I want to ask you is this. Is everythig not really too simple? Is the West not going to be uninterested in our disarmament initiatives until such time as our domestic politics, politics inside the CIS, is sorted out? In other words, until the numerous sources of tension are eliminated? Should we perhaps have laid the stress on domestic policy initially?

[Kozyrev] Well, the last part of the question is, so to speak, from a somewhat different area, but I have to say that foreign and domestic policy are inseparable. And, of course, simply by virtue of the fact that we are becoming a democratic state—in the full sense—real trust is emerging. It is by virtue of this that opportunities are opening for a transition to disarmament initiatives and because we no longer see the democratic countries of the West as the enemy and we are able to move on to profound reductions and because they, realizing that we have democratic control, are able to embark with us on disarmament.

But as far as figures are concerned, and the way they have responded to the radical reductions: The proposals of Bush and Baker—4,500 warheads, that is less by a half what we have today under the START treaty. Under the START treaty, we have 6,000 warheads. So, this is also a considerable reduction, but ours go a bit further. But, the devil is in the detail, as the Americans themselves say. And here it appears we are far from being simple, and they are not so simple, either, and I think that the time will now come—we will be meeting Baker in the very near future—when we will be discussing these details. But I would not—I do not have the feeling—that we are correct in everything and that they are wrong in everything. I think that we simply have to seek a sensible balance in these interests, but on a very specific level. This is a conversation between experts, and if there had been a little more time to answer, I would go even further into this.

[Tsvetov] Well, I think that LITERATURNAYA GAZETA will simply have to provide the space for an in-depth conversation on this subject.

[Kozyrev] An excellent idea.

[Tsvetov] Yes. Well, I would like to take advantage of my right as presenter and ask you a question, also from Russian Television. At the UN Human Rights Commission session in Geneva, Russia occupied a clear and uncompromising position in connection with human rights violations in Cuba. Why is the Russian Foreign Ministry's position not as definite in connection with the human rights violations in Nagorno-Karabakh? After all, this is now a foreign state as far as we are concerned.

[Kozyrev] Well, in the first place, I do not agree with that. Why do you consider that it is not as definite?

[Tsvetov] Well, at any rate, we do not know as much about it as we do about the position stated in Geneva.

[Kozyrev] Let us fill in the gaps now. It consists of the fact that we were the ones who were the initiators, the ones who proposed the mission which Schwartzenberg headed—he is what is called chancellor in Czechoslovakia; by the way, a former dissident and defender of human rights who, as they say, served his time in Czechoslovakia. Incidentally, in our country the human rights directorate in our Russian Foreign Ministry since last year has also been headed by a former dissident, who also learned from his own experience, (?Bakhmin).

In a word, we were the initiators of this mission which examined precisely this question of human rights. We have now come out as the initiators of mediation in Nagorno-Karabakh, and everywhere we support the idea that human rights knows no borders. Therefore, we in no way singled out Cuba, and there is nothing anti-Cuban here. In Karabakh, too, we are coming out in favor of human rights. Moreover, we will be firmer—by that I mean we will do so in the next few days in the Nordic Council—we will pose the human rights question in other states of the CIS, too, say in the Baltic regions.

We Russian Democrats supported the Balts against, so to speak, the center on the CPSU platform, you remember. But our moral right to raise the view that human rights, the rights of the Russians in the independent Baltic states, should be observed is today all the greater. So, we intend to continue to raise these matters insistently. [passage omitted]

[Tsvetov] IZVESTIA.

[IZVESTIA correspondent] I would like to continue, Andrey Vladimirovich, if you will allow, the theme of ideological legacy on a more specific example. As far as I understand it, your last visit to the Republic of South Africa was very successful, and you held talks there with the leaders of this state and with Nelson Mandela, president of the ANC [African National Congress]. But as far I understand it, you did not meet any representatives of the Inkatha Freedom Party and this is a very powerful organization representing at least 2 million people, and perhaps many more. Is there not an ideological legacy here?

[Kozyrev] No, the problem is that we cannot meet everyone, although we would like to. And we met Nelson Mandela—incidentally, I read a bit about that in IZVESTIA where that nuance was missing somewhat. We met him simply as an individual. The fact of the matter is that Nelson Mandela has become a symbol throughout the world. He is received by all leaders. On the whole, I am very honored that I had the good fortune to meet such a man. He is a defender of rights, in the first place, and we met him, namely in this capacity of his and not so much in the capacity of chairman of the ANC, that is to say, of one group, of one party. It is simply not possible to meet every party. [passage omitted]

[Tsvetov] KRASNAYA ZVEZDA

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent] Andrey Vladimirovich, as a participant in the talks with the United States, I would like you to comment upon, in my view, a sensational statement by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin in an interview with the newspaper IZVESTIA. I quote: Speaking of the zero flight task which our missiles will have, the president stated: This is not a unilateral measure which disarms us. We are implementing it on a mutual basis together with the United States. Well, have the Americans really given you such guarantees?

[Kozyrev] We are working on this now. That is a question which has been raised already. There are no simple solutions here because in principle, politically, we are no longer aiming missiles at each other.

[Correspondent, interrupting] Not us, the Americans ...

[Kozyrev, interrupting] And they are doing the same because they recognize that our relations are of a friendly nature, potentially of allies. It is another matter as to how that can be resolved technically, and we are working on that because the technical solution is very complex. I am not a specialist, but from what the specialists tell me, including our military specialists, that is a very complex technical problem. I think that in this respect, the essence of this quotation by the president lies in this—that yes, we are working with them on nullifying or dismantling these arms arsenals.

So a political decision was taken by both sides, and incidentally, Baker confirmed this in public at the news conference that we held together when he was here in Moscow. But we both confirm—and I reiterate this—that this is an extremely complicated thing from the technical point of view, and our military and civil specialists, scientists—by the way, Academician Velikhov is now working on this—should help us in this matter. I do not know which way this is done.

[Tsvetov] Well, now RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent] Thank you. Andrey Vladimirovich, I think that we all here, my colleagues, you and our esteemed moderator and Tanya [Krasnova] will agree that it is humiliating to be poor. But I will venture to mention—and I would like you to answer this question—that it is also unsafe to be poor. What do I have in mind? According to RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA information received from absolutely reliable sources, it is absolutely clear that the diplomatic mail bag service of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs is working with atrocious interruptions or even is not working at all to certain countries. That is, they have no money. Well, let us say that diplomatic couriers did not arrive in Austria either in January or February—I know this for sure. This means that one of the channels, the most reliable channel for delivering information both ways, from the center and from over there, has been practically switched off. Only coded telegrams and some other means have remained. But the U.S. NSA reads all coded messages, albeit with a certain delay.

Thus, the shortage of money experienced by our Ministry of Foreign Affairs threatens our national security. What is your attitude to this and what urgent measures does the government intend to take regarding this issue?

[Kozyrev] I am very grateful to you for this question. I hope that the Ministry of Finances is listening to our program now and will pay attention to this. In fact, we have such problems that certain embassies are selling their cars now. We are beginning to mortgage property in order to somehow provide for our own existence. Of course, this is an extremely difficult situation and there can be only one way out: to find financial sources somewhere. As a member of government, though, I know another side which is as follows: on the whole, we have emerged out of the Soviet Union and have a bad legacy, frankly speaking...

[Correspondent, interrupting] But national security is the supreme priority in all countries.

[Kozyrev] I would ask that these words be entered into the minutes.

[Tsvetov] Comrades, I would ask you to keep your questions as short as possible; this will enable Andrey Vladimirovich to give shorter answers and then everybody will have a chance to take part in the program. [passage omitted]

[Tsvetov] Well, now PRAVDA.

[PRAVDA correspondent] Andrey Vladimirovich, why is there such an obvious pro-Western bias in foreign policy? I do not have in mind some ideological aspect at all, but the absolute majority of visits and talks betray a pro-Western orientation, so to speak. But what about the eastern, Asian direction? Not only as a journalist but also as citizen I am worried by a kind of many-month long blocking of relations with China which we cannot help noticing. Maybe I am mistaken.

You know, perhaps some countries situated far from China can afford the luxury of raising human rights issues more vigorously in connection with China. But being a citizen of Russia, I have an enormously long border with China. What should one do about this? Is not it the time to make the Chinese direction a priority in our foreign policy, maybe even to exchange high-level visits?

[Kozyrev] Well, first, it has been made such; second, we have ratified a border treaty at the Supreme Soviet. Visits to China are being prepared now, in general.

Why is there a pro-Western bias? First of all, there are urgent things which had to be done over two-and-a-half or three months. The urgent things now include correcting a bias, getting rid of any sort of confrontation with the West on military issues in order to free our hands for reform. Second, we have now covered the Western Seven [Group of 7]. Whether we have a stabilization fund and whether we enter the world economy depends on the seven, eventually. With all due respect, China is not a world economic leader for the time being. On the other hand... [changes thought] Therefore, there is no underestimation; we simply do not have enough time, first of all; and second, we are already doing something. We have good relations with Turkey and a relevant treaty has been prepared.

But again, you and I will say: What is the president doing, if I start prompting him toward interminable visits. It is the president who should go everywhere, a presidential level is required everywhere. Treaties should be signed everywhere now. We have prepared them for practically all countries but, on the other hand, one cannot afford this, either.[passage omitted]

[Simonov] Simonov. Andrey Vladimirovich, I should like to ask a question regarding one foreign policy step which has left me bewildered, to be honest. I am referring to the decision to grant South Korea fishing rights near the islands of the Kurile ridge. I agree that such a decision might have needed to be taken sooner or later, but I cannot understand why it was taken right now. It could easily have been foreseen that it would lead to tension in Russo- Japanese relations, especially as Yeltsin had sent the Japanese prime minister a perfectly friendly message as recently as last week. How could you answer that?

[Kozyrev] First, not everything that we do is correct. Second, as has already been mentioned here, the mechanism of Russian statehood still produces slight failures sometimes, and interdepartmental partnership has not been established in every case. But we have existed as a fully independent state, responsible for everything, for just two-and-a-half months. In addition, we are needing not only to take the old machine but to renovate it as well, as has rightly been pointed out. To make a long story short, there are a great many problems. So, all the aspects exist here.

Finally, you know that there are so many emotions, so many local and other completely outside interests surrounding all these things in the Far East, and when will it end? But, generally speaking, we have to come to grips with finding a settlement, because the question which you are asking merely shows that we cannot brush aside this problem with Japan. It has not been settled. We have inherited it, but we have unresolved legal issues in the Far East, and we cannot pretend that everything is fine really. We cannot do anything. We cannot actually lift a finger on a firm legal foundation, because our problem with Japan has not been settled. [passage omitted in which Tsvetov invites participants to guess the identity of a "well-known world leader" who has asked a question to Kozyrev contained in a box on Tsvetov's desk. The panel make their guesses. Tsvetov asks Kozyrev to open the envelope containing the question]

It is quite a detailed question. Brevity in this case—although there is a lot of talent here in the question. [passage omitted; he reads the question] A visit to Japan by Mr. Yeltsin, the president of Russia, is scheduled for September this year. The visit should be epoch-making. You, Mr. Kozyrev, are planning to visit Japan in the spring. It is fair to expect that your arrival in Tokyo will be an important landmark in Japanese-Soviet relations— He evidently means Japanese-Russian relations—that the negotiations on the conclusion of a peace treaty between our countries will move forwards and that economic cooperation will receive a new impetus. I wish you success in Tokyo. In this connection, I should like to ask how resolutely and purposefully you intend to conduct your talks in Japan.

It is not hard to guess. It is Mr. Nakasone who is asking the question. He is a member of the Japanese parliament and a former prime minister of Japan. I am grateful for this question. I believe that it reflects the correct formulation of relations between Russia and Japan. I intend to conduct these talks resolutely and purposefully in all areas, but in such a way as not to destabilize the situation inside Russia, because otherwise we will be followed, or we might be followed, by a government which will again postpone all normalization with Japan for many years, and I should like this circumstance to be borne in mind on the Japanese islands. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent Kubich of RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] A very nice question, Andrey Vladimirovich, we know now that our best friend in northern Africa—I am giving, asking you this question the other way around out of delicacy—how much are we indebted to our best friend and when do we intend to return this debt?

[Kozyrev] In northern Africa?

[Kubich] I mean Egypt, of course.

[Kozyrev] I would say that we are indebted and we are owed. I would put it that way. There is a fairly complex situation there. We will return and debts will be returned to us. To be honest, I see no particular problems there.

[Kubich] [Question indistinct]

[Kozyrev] With Egypt?

[Kubich] Military equipment and everything?

[Kozyrev] No, these debts were after all payed to us earlier too. The fact that they are indebted to us—but in fact this is a country which pays, I personally see no big problems in this sense. [passage omitted]

Churkin Gives Briefing on International Policy

LD0303233692 Moscow TASS in English 2134 GMT 2 Mar 92

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondents Sergey Staroselskiy and Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow, March 3 TASS—Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kosyrev's visits to Angola, the Republic of South Africa and Egypt which ended on Sunday [1 March], showed that Russia is still interested in strengthening and developing ties with countries on the African Continent, Vitaliy Churkin, head of the Russian foreign ministry information directorate, told a briefing in Moscow on Monday [2 March].

When in Angola, he said, we became convinced that the settlement process in this country is progressing successfully on the whole, despite the quite understandable difficulties. The first positive developments have been achieved thanks to the end of the armed conflict. Practically all political forces in the country are approaching the elections with slogans in favour of democracy and a market economy realizing that experimenting with other social models will lead to a deadlock. Russia, together with Portugal, the U.S. and the United Nations, will promote the successful settlement in Angola, Churkin stressed.

He reiterated that an agreement has been reached to close the former Soviet military mission in Angola. However, Churkin added, it does not mean we refuse to cooperate with Angola on military and technical issues in peaceful conditions. There is also the possibility of developing mutually advantageous economic ties between the two countries.

Speaking of Andrey Kozyrev's visit to the Republic of South Africa where a joint statement on the establishment of diplomatic relations was signed, Churkin noted that "this step is made in the context of efforts to finally liquidate the apartheid system, it promotes the establishment of principles of democracy and human rights in South Africa." The visit not only marked the beginning of contacts with F.W. de Klerk's government conducting a policy of dismantling apartheid but also strengthened our relations with democratic and anti-apartheid forces headed by Nelson Mandela.

The visit of the Russian Foreign Minister to Egypt confirmed the importance of this country as one of the key Middle East partners of Russia. Churkin stressed that Russia and Egypt are taking the common position of rejecting extremism in any form.

Our country took the U.N. Security Council Resolution on U.N. operations in Cambodia with great satisfaction, said the Russian Foreign Ministry representative. This decision which passed unanimously is an important landmark in the process of the comprehensive political settlement of the Cambodian problem and aimed at protecting human rights and guaranteeing the right of the Cambodian people for self-determination by way of free and just elections. The establishment of a temporary U.N. body on Cambodia marks one of the largest peacemaking operations in history of the United Nations, Churkin said. He stressed that Russia, being a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council, is ready to contribute to the restoration of peace and stability in Cambodia.

Commenting on the statement of Lozoraitis, the Lithuanian Ambassador to Washington, saying that "the day will come" when "the Kaliningrad region will become part of Lithuania", Churkin said: "The Kaliningrad region is and will be part of the Russian Federation and this status is secured by international law." He added that this kind of statement made by a Lithuanian official is absolutely unacceptable and is dangerous for Russian-Lithuanian relations.

"In his interview the Lithuanian Ambassador also spoke of the necessity to prevent the creation of a Berlin-Moscow axis. We do not understand why a diplomat from a third country should have an affect on the German-Russian relations. It is not normal diplomatic practice. We are expecting official explanations on these issues from the Lithuanian side," Churkin concluded.

Yeltsin-Nakasone Talks, Peace Treaty Viewed

OW0403121892 Moscow Radio Moscow in Japanese 1300 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Kondrachev commentary: "Russian-Japanese Relations in the Process of Seeking New Course of Development"]

[Text] As it has been reported in our news program, Yasuhiro Nakasone, noted Japanese politician and former prime minister, is visiting Moscow from 1 to 4 March as a guest of the Russian Supreme Soviet. Former Prime Minister Nakasone held talks with Russian President Boris Yeltsin on 2 March. In this connection, we will now broadcast a commentary by Radio Moscow commentator Kondrachev:

The mission of former Prime Minister Nakasone's visit to Moscow lies in discussing prospects for relations between Russia and Japan. In particular, the topic brought up as the major theme for discussions at his talks with President Yeltsin is the issue on the conclusion of a peace treaty between the two nations. In fact, it is impossible to talk about the complete normalization of bilateral relations unless a peace treaty has been concluded.

It is a very unusual case without any precedent, that no peace treaty has been concluded between these two nations in the 47 years since the end of World War II. Regarding this point, President Yeltsin and former Prime Minister Nakasone have reached an accord in their views that a peace treaty will have to be concluded before the end of this century. What is the so-called stumbling block that lies in the course of concluding a peace treaty? It goes without saying that the stumbling block is the question of the title to the southern Kuril Islands. In the Japanese way of saying, it is the northern territorial issue.

It seems that both Russia and Japan have already stated clearly the grounds of their own argument, as well as their counterarguments against the other side concerning this issue. It is quite apparent that the solution to this issue lies in a creative approach and mutual concessions. Of course, in trying to settle the issue, the domestic political situation must be taken into consideration.

For instance, is it possible to neglect such factors as the views of the current Russian Government, as well as the public opinion shared by a considerably large number of the Russian people, and the local residents' opposition to the transfer of the islands to Japan? In the meantime, the Russian Government has indicated its readiness to seek a way out of the current situation on the basis of the 1956 Soviet-Japanese Joint Statement, in which the former Soviet Union agreed to the return of the two islands—Habomai and Shikotanto—to Japan. However, the Japanese Government has persisted in its strong position that the four islands must be returned immediately and en bloc.

It is quite apparent that the persistent stance taken by the Japanese Government under the current circumstances will only lead to an increase in the number of people opposing the return of the islands in the Russian Republic. For example, the Japanese Government has taken diplomatic measures against the conclusion of an agreement between Russia and the ROK on fishing operations in the area of the disputed islands, and this action has had an unpleasant after effect. We feel that the fact that these islands are still under Russian jurisdiction should not be forgotten.

Nevertheless, all the people feel that the territorial issue will be resolved and a peace treaty will eventually be concluded. It is precisely in such an atmosphere that President Yeltsin recently wrote a personal message to Japanese Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa. The current Yeltsin-Nakasone talks were held under such a tune.

Tokyo Sees No Progress on Territorial Issue

LD0303214692 Moscow TASS in English 0926 GMT 3 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vasiliy Golovnin]

[Text] Tokyo, March 3 ITAR-TASS—Tokyo attaches much importance to a meeting between Russian President Boris Yeltsin and former Japanese Prime Minister, prominent leader of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party Yasuhiro Nakasone held in Moscow on Monday [2 March]. Tokyo does not believe, however, that this meeting has brought closer the solution of the territorial issue between the two countries, General Secretary of the Cabinet of Ministers Koichi Kato told a regular news conference here.

Kato said it had been an important meeting. President Yeltsin had sincerely explained the problems posed to him by the territorial issue, and it was of much interest. Kato said the Russian president had noted it was not the right time to raise the problem since the public of the country was busy tackling difficult domestic problems. In Kato's words, Yeltsin made it plain that the failure of the present reforms in Russia would have undermined any prospects of concluding a peace treaty. There had been no peace treaty between the two countries from the times of the Second World War.

In this connection, the general secretary of cabinet, as an official representative of the Japanese Government, said that the president's statements had contained no new suggestions towards settling the issue. In Kato's words, the Russian president was cautious as ever on the territorial issue. Kato said he did not think that President Yeltsin, stating the readiness for achieving progress on this problem, indicated that it would be possible to resolve it ultimately during his official visit to Japan this September.

As is known, Tokyo demands that Russia return to Japan the South Kuriles—Iturup, Kunashir, Shikotanto and Habomai islands. It is believed in Japan that the islands were illegally occupied by the USSR in 1945. A few days ago Japan lodged an official protest with Moscow for its permitting South Korean fishermen to conduct fishing operations near these islands. Tokyo thus indicated it does not recognise Russia's right to decide at its discretion matters of economic cooperation with third countries in the zone.

KYODO TSUSHIN news agency writes that the statement of the general secretary of the cabinet made on Tuesday [3 March] showed a cautious approach of the Japanese Government which is striving to discourage somewhat the exaggerated expectations connected with Yeltsin's upcoming visit.

Honecker Returns to Chilean Embassy in Moscow

OW0403133392 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1256 GMT 4 Mar 92

[From "Diplomatic Panorama;" transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Wednesday [4 March] the Chilean Embassy in Moscow confirmed that Erich Honecker is in its compound again as "a guest of the Chilean Ambassador." In an interview for DP's ["Diplomatic Panorama"] correspondent Counsellor Jose Cruz declined to comment on the state of health of the former East German leader who had spent 9 days in the special clinic for foreign diplomats of the Botkin Hospital in Moscow, undergoing medical examination. The permission to release this kind of information, he said, can be given only by the Chilean Foreign Ministry in Santiago where the results of examination had been sent.

The Counsellor declined to say whether the situation concerning Erich Honecker is a "diplomatic impasse" or not.

Nothing was said as to what countries will be involved in negotiations on the further destiny of the former East German leader.

A diplomat at the Russian Foreign Ministry who wished to remain anonymous told DP's correspondent that "he sees no reason why in the present circumstances Russia should interfere in the efforts to resolve the issue of Erich Honecker which ought to be decided solely between Chile and Germany".

Trade Agreement Reached With Estonia

MK0303145992 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 3 Mar 92 p 2

[Yelena Visens report: "Estonia: Fuel Solves Everything. Estonian Premier's First Visit to Moscow"]

[Text] In the wake of Latvia, which held talks in Moscow with Russia on matters of trade and economic cooperation and signed three appendices to the intergovernmental agreement with Russia for 1992, an Estonian delegation has also come to Moscow for the same purpose.

In the opinion of experts, Estonia is now in the most serious economic position of the three Baltic states. In the first two months of this year state prices of gasoline have risen several times (from 10 rubles [R] at the beginning of January to R25-36—depending on the kind of gasoline—in mid-February). In many respects this is due to the import of fuel from the West, in particular from Finland and Norway. Industrial and agricultural power consumption has dropped by a third. Tariffs for passenger transport and city transport have risen. State food subsidies have been ended.

Production continued to fall in January: by 50.5 percent at the "Asto" industrial association, 41.1 percent at meat and dairy enterprises, and 35 percent at the "State Grain Store" Association.

Largely because of the shortage of fuel and raw materials, some of Estonia's enterprises have been forced to cut production or even totally stop it, putting staff on indefinite leave. Thus in January the "Eesti Kaabel" electrical equipment plant came to a standstill. The "Kalev" confectionery factory, the "Elektrotekhnika" and "Estoplast" Plants, and the "Norma" plastics plant have switched to a shortened work regime.

In the same period Russia, which was until recently the main supplier of fuel, raw materials, and spare parts for many of Estonia's industrial enterprises, did not send the republic a single liter of oil. Trade between Russia and Estonia has virtually been axed.

Estonia concluded a trade and economic agreement with Russia back in 1991. An additional protocol on mutual deliveries for 1992 was signed 22 January 1992. But no solution satisfactory to both sides was found on many points—including the size of deliveries and the system of payment.

The protocol and three appendices to the intergovermental agreement on principles for Russian-Estonian trade and economic cooperation for 1992 that Estonian Prime Minister Tiit Vahi and Russian Vice Premier Yegor Gaydar signed list and stipulate the size of deliveries and their approximate value. As with Latvia, most of the mutual deliveries will be carried out on a clearing basis, with dollars subsequently converted into rubles on the basis of world prices. The protocol makes provision for free passage of goods across the two states' territory with only loading and unloading paid for in rubles.

Russia will supply Estonia with gasoline, diesel fuel, fuel oil, and diesel oil worth a total of roughly $157 million under the "small-scale clearing" system. Estonia will supply foodstuffs (meat, milk, and meat and dairy produce, fish) and air cooling apparatus for drilling rigs worth roughly $151 million. For many kinds of goods restrictions have been lifted on direct trade between enterprises, which have been authorized to autonomously specify the size of the deliveries and range of goods in line with world prices.

Progress of Talks With IMF Assessed

MK0303154092 Moscow KURANTY in Russian 3 Mar 92 p 3

["Our Commentary" by Mikhail Shchipanov: "Has the Fund's Ghost Adopted Us?"]

[Text] Over the last few days the IMF has increasingly been reminiscent of the notorious ghost of Hamlet's father, which has appeared virtually exclusively to Ye. Gaydar and his team. At any rate, the vice premier has recently been hinting once again about special relations with the fund, but has not provided details of this "honeymoon." However, the latest meeting of representatives of the G-7 [Group of Seven], which effectively controls IMF leadership bodies, did not raise the question of admitting the Union's heirs to this organization. If we are to believe the deputy U.S. secretary of finance, the economic grandees preferred to intensively discuss the ups-and-downs of their next annual reception in Munich, to which B. Yeltsin may also, incidentally, be invited.

So, how is our "romance" with the IMF really developing? According to reports from circles close to the IMF, talks between Russia and IMF experts on formulating a general agreement are nearing completion. In effect, according to various estimates, a week or two are to be devoted to finally getting to grips with the "shadowy" treaty. Russia is assuming tough commitments to continue liberalizing the centralized economy which it inherited and religiously observe financial discipline. However, experts "privy" to the fund's secrets indicate that the agreement now being formulated skirts a question of fundamental importance for the incumbent Russian Government, namely the stabilization of the ruble. Yet it is this problem that Gaydar is making the center of his reforms that are arousing such passions.

However, it is becoming clear that Russia and the IMF have not as yet been able to decide the best strategy for supporting something that "rustles, but is not money." IMF representatives are not evincing certainty that the creation of the widely publicized 6-billion stabilization fund will indeed be the most effective means of curing the ruble of its impotence. If that is indeed the case, and there is no reason not to believe U.S. specialists, the constant government references to the "oxygen cylinder" promised by the fund seem to be a drawback of our Russian tradition of a state monopoly on information. Admittedly, every cloud has a silver lining. Even a "shadowy" agreement—that is, one that has not come into force—may be an important trump card during Russia's talks with the banks about more credits. Bankers always listen most attentively to IMF recommendations and the very fact that there is an agreement should be a sign that the fund has confidence in the pace and nature of the economic transformations that we have begun. After all, the IMF's other patient—Argentina—has managed to enter a period of economic growth. It is not for nothing that people in Buenos Aires, fearing a future manpower shortage, are thinking seriously about inviting emigres from Eastern Europe, and in particular from the Baltic.

Areas of Attention Noted

PM0303151592 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Mar 92 First Edition p 1

["Commentary" by Aleksandr Golubev: "How Will the Fund's Loans Be Received?"]

[Excerpts] The government has taken one more step toward joining the IMF—a memorandum has been compiled and by and large approved on the Russian Federation's economic policy, and it will be sent to the IMF. There will obviously be much to be said about the economic aspects of this document, but I would like to dwell on a problem of a somewhat different kind.

I have in mind the political backing for the sort of tempo of reforms which the IMF and the World Bank will be demanding from us. It is no secret that these financial organizations are by no means Santa Clauses, handing out loans to all who need them. [passage omitted]

Let us recall the examples, so dear to our press, from the experience of Third World countries which have managed in recent decades (and not least thanks to the aid of the IMF and World Bank) to transform themselves from "banana republics" into extremely respectable states economically speaking. What kind of political backing did their economic reforms have? In perhaps the two most indicative states of Latin America—Chile and Brazil—the evolution of a modern economic model took place in conditions of military dictatorship, that is to say that social unrest was eliminated by strong-arm methods. It is difficult to imagine our president taking this path. Especially in view of the fact that our Army does not look at all like the guardian of market ideals, whereas the South American military regimes were only reforming their markets—from "banana" markets into modern, Western markets, while in Chile they simply defended the market against socialist transformations.

There is another path: to eliminate social unrest, when it has reached its peak, by replacing a government which will have exhausted the limits of public confidence. [Deputy Premier and Minister of Finance] Ye. Gaydar has also spoken of the need for reform cabinets to be prepared to resign. If events develop in this direction, then we might have our own version of the "Italian scenario." But in economic conditions which are far worse than Italy's, government crises could afford forces for whom authoritarian or totalitarian rule looks perfectly natural an opportunity to seize the initiative. And then we would have to forget reforms, and civilized human life likewise, for a long time to come.

Thus it seems to me that while there is still time before entering the IMF and the World Bank, it should be spent not only on elucidating the economic aspects of this procedure but also on searching for the internal political path along which collaboration with these financial structures would be effected with maximum stability.

Federation Affairs

Government Leaders Meet With People's Deputies

Burbulis, Gaydar Cited

LD0303183792 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1624 GMT 3 Mar 92

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondents Galina Vinnitskaya and Aleksey Tabachnikov]

[Text] Moscow, 3 Mar (TASS)—The "liberalization of prices, privatization, and the agrarian program continue to be the main directions of the reform," according to Gennadiy Burbulis, Russian first deputy prime minister and secretary of state. He presented a memorandum on the Russian Federation's economic policy to parliamentary deputies at their traditional meeting with the leaders of the government today.

According to Burbulis, the memorandum reflects the fundamental issues in the economic reform, which take into account past experiences and future prospects. "This document is not a radical U-turn in economic policy, but a continuation of the course we have adopted," he noted.

"This is a declaration of our intentions, of what needs to be done to stabilize the economy," according to Yegor Gaydar, first deputy chairman for economic reform of the Russian Government and finance minister, who also spoke at the meeting. He believes that one of the major problems now is the drop in production in Russia, which is happening because of a sharp reduction—by 41 percent—of import supplies. He cited the maintenance of their necessary volumes as the main political task. "We have no liquid resources for supporting the balance of payments," Yegor Gaydar noted. "The World Bank and the IMF are prepared to offer us these resources, which is a testimony to their support for our reforms."

The memorandum is aimed at presenting the priorities of the reform to the international financial community.

Yegor Gaydar announced that a Russian presidential decree has been signed on additional measures for social support of the population, which envisages an increase of 200 rubles in all types of allowances. A decision on a 150-percent salary hike for non-industrial workers is being prepared.

Gaydar on Production, Payments 'Crisis'

LD0303220192 Moscow Programma Radio Odin Network in Russian 1600 GMT 3 Mar 92

["Excerpt" from report by Yegor Gaydar, first deputy chairman for economic reform of the Russian government and finance minister, delivered at meeting with Russian parliamentary deputies in Moscow on 3 March—recorded]

[Text] If you remember, I have never promised anyone that there would be a life of plenty while the transition is in progress. You say, first, that it is possible to unfreeze prices. Second, that it is possible to prevent hyperinflation. Third, that it is possible to start establishing the purchasing power of the ruble. That it is possible to start raising the rate of the national currency. That at the same time the shops will gradually start filling up, not immediately but gradually. The first price climb will not mean immediate entry into a spiral of hyperinflation, during which goods still will not appear, and at the same time there will be a perceptible decline in industrial production [words indistinct].

Today the first five or six positions have been more or less met. There is a drastic decline in industrial production. So what? The same thing is happening everywhere. Let's have a look at some examples: The successful examples you have discussed in recent years. Czechoslovakia: how much have you seen on television on the progress of reform in Czechoslovakia? And you said: why is it not like that here? Industrial production in Czechoslovakia, I should like to remind you, features against the background of a far easier civilization than our own [words indistinct]. Unfortunately losses and inefficiency of production [words indistinct] are the natural laws of a socialist economy. That is the first point.

The second point concerns the crisis of payments. It is because everything is going to plan that today there is really a serious payments crisis in the national economy. The simplest thing, there could be nothing simpler, would be to get rid of this payments crisis. Life would be a lot simpler without it. All you would need to do is tell the Central Bank to increase the money in circulation by three to four times. After that, you will stop holding on to your money. You will be able to adapt to any prices. Your output will be bought whatever the price. This immediately pushes up wages and then consumer prices. After that everyone will start to wonder why following a fine and pleasant measure like boosting industry and supplementing means of payment in order to do so, goods suddenly disappear again while those that are available are sold at constantly soaring prices. And for this very reason we must be, are obliged to be, extremely restrained. This does not mean, it goes without saying, that we have to be, or need to be, merciless whereas we do have to, and we can, face the real problems and the processes that are actually taking place. This means that support must be precisely aimed.

Gaydar on Free Prices

OW0303163492 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1557 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At a meeting with People's Deputies Tuesday [3 March] Russian Vice Prime Minister Yegor Gaydar confirmed the Cabinet's plans to free prices on all products which are still subjects of price control. Gaydar said that this step was made more urgent by the freeing of prices on a number of these goods by local authorities.

Gaydar feels the liberalization of fuel prices is the most difficult step as it may spur an increase in prices in other areas of industry as well. The government estimates that fuel prices will rise by 50-70% after prices are freed.

Commenting on fiscal problems, Gaydar said that the real goal will be to lower the Russian budget deficit by the end of the fourth quarter of 1992 to not more than 1% of the gross national product.

Gaydar said a decision was passed to increase salaries of employees of budgetary departments nearly one and a half times.

The Vice Prime Minister said that "the volume of capital leaving the country has reached 5-6 million rubles recently". Gaydar said he hopes to receive some information by mid March from the firm Crow International which was employed by the government to uncover the Communist Party's secret foreign accounts.

New Vice Premiers' Duties Not 'Petty Tutelage'

PM0403140992 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Mar 92 Morning Edition p 2

[Vasiliy Kononenko article: "G. Burbulis and Ye. Gaydar Will Now Share Responsibility"]

[Text] The new top appointments in the Russian Government—Ye. Gaydar has become first vice premier and V. Makharadze vice premier—came as a complete surprise even to the immediate circle of power. Hence the main conclusion which can be drawn is that the initiative for the changes in the alignment of forces came from the president on this occasion. Previously he had, as a rule, submitted such questions for discussion in a narrow circle of trusted officials.

What do the new appointments change on a practical level? According to information from government sources, G. Burbulis will be in charge of the area of the political bloc in which the services and state institutions under the leadership of S. Shakhray and M. Poltoranin work. Ye. Gaydar will now be fully responsible for the work of the bloc of economic departments and services run by A. Shokhin and V. Makharadze, who headed the control administration, which collects and analyzes information from heads of administration at local level. V. Makharadze has been charged with the operational management of the national economy—a post akin to "chief supervisor."

It is to be supposed that the stewardship of the first vice premiers will not amount just to petty tutelage. Even if they really wanted to take on this onerous task, Burbulis and Gaydar are not in a position to do anything since the government today is still reminiscent of a "firefighting squad" forced to ignore alarm signals about localized fires in order to prevent major ones.

At the same time it is perfectly obvious that henceforth (and this view is shared by people we have spoken to in the government) Burbulis, while remaining, according to one government expert, the "first chief deputy," will be responsible for a more or less specific range of cabinet work, while Gaydar becomes "plenipotentiary" and the person chiefly responsible for the progress of economic reforms. It is no doubt for this reason that Burbulis received the the president's decree as a "good piece of news," while Gaydar "gulped" in response to his colleagues' congratulations.

The new configuration of forces in government is undoubtedly at variance with the president's initial statements that the managerial apparatus and management team would be of minimum size. At the same time the decree does indicate recognition of the sad reality that the Russian economy, like everything else, is not yet self-regulating and has to be steered.

Yeltsin Appoints Shakray Airspace Control Head

LD2902110892 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0900 GMT 29 Feb 92

[Text] Boris Yeltsin has signed a decree setting up a commission for the use of airspace and air traffic control. It is to be headed by Sergey Shakhray.

Present Government 'Could Be Forced To Resign'

PM0303144892 Copenhagen DET FRI AKTUELT in Danish 2 Mar 92 p 10

[Report on interview with Yeltsin adviser Pavel Bunich by Per Dalgard; place, date not given]

[Text] A Yeltsin adviser visiting Denmark thinks that the first phase of the reforms has been a success. But it will be necessary to listen more to the people. The next crisis will occur in April.

Yeltsin's government must think less theoretically and start listening to the people and taking account of social factors. Otherwise the people will remove the government from power.

This was the message from one of the Russian president's top economists, Academician Pavel Bunich, who has just visited Odense. Bunich is probably the man in Yeltsin's inner circle with the best understanding of the market economy and the mixed economy.

Bunich was reluctant to comment on Supreme Soviet President Khasbulatov's recent remarks to the effect that Yeltsin should leave the post of head of government. However, he does not rule out the possibility that the present government could be forced to resign, but he stressed that "this does not mean that Yeltsin would resign as president. We cannot do without Yeltsin at the rudder. After being forced to concern himself exclusively with political matters for such a long time, he has now thrown himself into work on the economy, and he has made the transition phenomenally well.

"The government has had success with the first part of the reforms," Bunich continued. "It succeeded in starting the shock therapy with price liberalization and the consequent fall in living standards without producing a social explosion. The people have suffered the first phase of the reforms, but there is no guarantee that that they will also accept the next phase. That is why the government must now start taking account of social factors. There is a limit to people's patience."

According to Bunich, the next test of people's patience will be 2 April when the last state-set prices—on fuel, milk, bread, and vodka—will be removed. The rise in the price of fuel will lead to at least a doubling of the prices of a long list of goods, Bunich said.

"And so we have to bring in the social dimension. Wages and pensions must be adjusted in line with prices every month, taxes and levies reduced, and we cannot avoid having to fight excessively high prices that many monopoly enterprises will set."

The Russian economist also rejected that criticism that has been leveled against the government that it was wrong to begin the reforms with price liberalization before privatization. "It is only a marginal problem, and we could under no circumstances have waited until privatization had been completed. It is now proceeding apace, and we expect around 30 percent of state enterprises will be privatized in the course of this year. At best privatization will last two years. And at least 25 percent will remain in the state sector."

Pavel Bunich has many years of experience of the market economy and the mixed economy in Soviet and Russian society.

As long ago as the seventies he headed the country's first market-oriented research institute, and this was the reason why Mikhail Gorbachev made him a member of the Communist Party Central Committee and a personal adviser as soon as he came to power.

"At Gorbachev's request, together with my colleague Stanislav Shatalin and others, I was asked to initiate perestroyka and start a gradual transition to a market economy," said the sixty-year-old economics professor who is also chairman of the almost 12 million members of the employers' Association of Independent Businessmen and Farmers.

"In 1985 at the 27th Congress there was great enthusiasm. In our euphoria over Gorbachev we believed that it was possible to change the party in the direction of democracy. When it turned out that this was not the case, we left the party and I became Yeltsin's economic adviser," said Pavel Bunich, who nevertheless still has good contacts with both Gorbachev and Yeltsin's critic, Khasbulatov, the president of the Supreme Soviet.

Even though the government may be forced to resign, Bunich does not fear a takeover by old-style communists fascists.

"When it comes down to it, there are not that many of them. According to our opinion polls, the red-browns—that is, the alliance between various communist parties and Zhirinovskiy's fascist so-called Liberal Party—together only amount to around 10 percent of the population. Naturally, a new government would be more reticent and cautious than the present government, but it would be neither red not black."

And what ideology lies behind the present leadership?

"Here at the end of the twentieth century there can be no suggestion of pure socialism or pure capitalism. We still want to have a large public sector, but this is not an ideological demand. It is pure pragmatism.

"If we are to talk at all about ideology, I would say that what we are engaged in building is a sort of mixed economy based on democratic and social principles. Social-democratism—that is the correct word," said the optimistic presidential adviser who is, as he put it, an optimist despite the great absence of Western support.

"I base my optimism on the fact that I know Russians are not born cripples. We can do things, and we will probably get through these years of crisis successfully with or without Western help. In the past we lived well, but there was no reason for optimism. Now we live under appalling conditions, but now there is good reason for optimism."

Interior Minister Reports Increase in Crime

OW0303171292 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1557 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] There was a total of 2,200 thousand crimes committed in Russia last year, Russia's Interior Minister Viktor Yerin said at Tuesday's [3 March] press conference in Moscow. 41 thousand people were injured and approximately 15 thousand killed, with half of all murders committed as a result of domestic conflicts. In January, the crime rate was up by 26% against the same period last year, Yerin said, adding that the share of property crimes was on the increase. "Forecasts do not let us look optimistically into the future—the crime rate will continue to climb given a new impetus by an increase in the jobless rate", the minister said.

Among the most affected areas in terms of criminality he mentioned Moscow, St Petersburg, Yekaterinburg, the Perm and Novosibirsk regions and other big cities. If viewed in terms of growth rates, however, Adygeya, Hakassia, the Tomsk, Smolensk and some other regions would come to the foreground.

The crime-rate situation will begin to improve in 2-3 years' time after the economy is on the road to recovery.

Answering a question asked by IF's [INTERFAX's] correspondent, Yerin said there were quite numerous attempts to smuggle weapons into explosive areas of the CIS.

The interior minister praised the interior department of Moscow for its behavior during rallies on February 23. "As minister, I have nothing to reproach them of", he said.

Yerin stressed that he "would vote with both hands for granting citizens the right to carry direct contact weapons such as gas canisters. At the same time he disapproved of the possibility of openly selling fire arms to citizens except for selling shotguns to farmers.

Presents Crime Statistics

LD0303172992 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1422 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Excerpt] Russia's Internal Affairs Minister Viktor Fedorovich Yerin gave a news conference today. He gave some troubling statistics about the growth of crime throughout last year and in the first month of this year. The Ministry of Internal Affairs forecasts that the growth in the crime rate will continue. During January alone 166,000 crimes were recorded in Russia. There is growth, too, in qualitative terms, or to put it more exactly, crimes are being carried out in a more professional way. Here is another troubling figure: In a year the lives of 13,000 of our fellow countrymen have been lost, and this does not include road casualties.

Viktor Yerin set out his concept of more precise and professional work by internal affairs bodies. At the news conference much was said about the new realities of our life, but once again from the criminal point of view. [passage omitted]

Draft of New Criminal Code Criticized

LD0303235992 Moscow TASS in English 1438 GMT 3 Mar 92

[By CRIME-PRESS correspondent Nikolay Stepanchenko]

[Text] March 3 TASS—The draft of the new criminal code of Russia needs to be scrutinized more carefully, Major-General of Justice Vasiliy Koliverda, prosecutor of the Moscow military district, told CRIME-PRESS on Tuesday [3 March]. "A number of its articles are dim and unclear", according to him.

Koliverda especially criticised article 133, which envisages a penalty for sexual harassment of minors. The article determines criminal prosecution for intercourse with an underage person. "In other words,—the lawyer said,—seducer is supposed to decide by eye if he [is] dealing with a sexually mature person. It's nonsense. I think the article should set certain age".

There are other shortcomings, Koliverda said. For example, article 131 states that an offense, committed repeatedly, should not be considered as a relapse if the offender was previously exempted from prosecution or convictions. "A person, who committed crime repeatedly, is obviously more dangerous for society than a first-time offender," Koliverda stated. "According to the draft, both would get the same penalty, which is not right".

Koliverda suggested the new code should be adopted only after serious consultations with practicing lawyers.

Conference Notes Local Resistance to Reform

MK0303154592 Moscow KURANTY in Russian 3 Mar 92 p 2

[Eduard Dorozhkin report: "Peace and Quiet in the Boondocks"]

[Text] "Nowhere else in the world are such concessions envisaged in the privatization of state property as in Russia," Anatoliy Chubays said, answering a question about labor collectives' rights in the new market conditions.

It was probably not without reason that eminent Russian authorities visited the first all-Russian conference of the committees supporting Russian reforms in Moscow last weekend. As you know, there is only talk in Moscow, while the action happens in the localities. But it is there, according to delegates, that everything is still the same, and reforms are making no progress, mainly due to resistance from former party personnel who have managed to change profession in time and become the head of concerns or obtain posts as deputies. Often local organs of power deliberately sabotage the Russian president's decrees. And you could see from what the region's representatives said at the congress that the situation in the Russian heartland is indeed dismal. "If you become a private farmer, we will fire your wife!" A delegate from Omsk Oblast spoke of this supremely original approach to introducing new forms of economic management. It is the same throughout Russia. That is why the committees set up on the initiative of the "Democratic Russia" movement are in fact probably necessary.

Russian Citizenship Law Effective as of 3 Mar

LD0303184292 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1600 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Text] The citizenship law came into force in Russia today. The rayon directorates of internal affairs began on

1 March to accept applications from persons who wish to become Russian citizens. The Russian Internal Affairs Ministry is preparing a draft decision on the introduction of Russian passports. As has become known, Ukraine and Belarus are also preparing to introduce passports of their own.

Commentator on Russian Draft Federal Treaty

LD0203221892 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 2 Mar 92

[Station Commentary by Vitaliy Gurov]

[Excerpts] It has been reported in the Russian day to day parliament that a draft federal treaty is practically ready. The treaty will settle all the major and minor legal issues in the relationships between the constituent republics, territories and large regions in Russia. [passage omitted] More from our commentator Vitaliy Gurov.

Today it is clear that the federal treaty is an attempt at reconciliation, at quieting down the passions that have been running high over the sharpest problems that may entail unpredictable results. These are territorial claims of one nationality entity to another as well as delineation of the powers and prerogatives between the federal center and the local authorities. There are also problems of economic integration, mutually advantageous exchanges and trade. The latest facts show all these problems are very acute now. [passage omitted]

The federal treaty should solve many of these problems and yet there is a danger that the path Russia will follow will be an exact repetition of the path taken by the Soviet Union. Even half a year ago, in late August, a Union treaty might have been signed but for the abortive coup. Soon afterwards the process of disintegration brought about a fall of the huge empire that used to occupy one sixth of the world's land. The USSR broke up into 15 states so far and now the process of a split threatens Russia, the largest republic.

Internationality problems are arising in practically every ethnic autonomous unit, though not in the mononationality, strictly Russian, regions. There is an ancient saying that apples of the unexpected ripen on branches' irregularities. Hopefully a fast growth of such apples is not provoked by decisions taken by the Russian MPs [members of parliament] on issues of interstate, interrepublican relations.

Arms Exports Earnings Would Ease Conversion

PM0303101192 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 28 Feb 92 First Edition pp 1-2

[Interview with Mikhail Maley, Russian Federation state counselor for questions of conversion, by Yevgeniy Panov under the "Conversion" rubric; place and date not given: "Weapons Exports... And Why Not?"]

[Text] For a long time emotions predominated when discussing problems of conversion. Not one of the old ideas ever worked, and no one advanced any fresh ones. Speeches by the Russian leaders—the vice president and the speaker of parliament—were marked by emotions, but certainly not by novel approaches. But then, at last, something happened recently. The Soviet of the Republic examined the law on conversion. M. Bazhanov, chairman of the State Committee for Conversion, spoke of the trade in weapons as a source of funds to reprofile the defense industry. At first sight, neither the emphasis on legislative regulation nor, still less, Bazhanov's premise is at all indisputable. How are they to be rated in the light of the country's position today? This was the subject of my conversation with Mikhail Maley, Russian Federation state counselor for questions of conversion.

"In parliament I advanced a proposal to adopt the law," Mikhail Dmitriyevich said, "although it is contradictory. It very neatly bypasses the question of the source of funding for conversion. Here it states: Enterprises being converted must produce consumer goods and agricultural equipment. The simplest calculations show that labor productivity in defense plants falls by a factor of 30-120 at the moment of transition. How can such a drop be compensated for? By increasing prices? But then the output of the military-industrial complex becomes frightfully expensive and uncompetitive on the domestic market. By squeezing production? But this means virtually losing machine building... At the same time these are not some specifically Russian problems. They are characteristic of the whole world. The unambiguous conclusion is that conversion is loss-making and costly..."

[Panov] I should probably elaborate: It is loss-making and costly to begin with.

[Maley] I will not argue. At some time a flower can grow even in the desert. But, to begin with, conversion makes a loss, not a profit. It is clear even today that there is no money for it in the Russian budget. Therefore a law which bypasses the question of funds is nothing more than a declaration. It has no bearing on people's destinies. Yet conversion affects 12 million working people. With families—30 million people. If the military-industrial complex collapses, Russia's entire industry will also collapse.

[Panov] It seems to me that the problem of conversion was always a political one in our country. They stubbornly translated it to the plane of politics, pushing the economic aspects into the background. Hence the question of the source of funding seemed secondary.

[Maley] Yes, right from the start they posed the problem as a political, ideological one. They were deceiving themselves: Conversion will resolve all our difficulties. They were deceiving the West: Look, we are demilitarizing ourselves... In practice this conversion was simplistic—physical, not economic. It did not and could not take place.

This is why I am advancing the concept of economic conversion today. Of what does it consist? The military-industrial complex of the USSR and now of Russia used to hang and still hangs round the taxpayers' neck. Live money and labor are being turned into a weapon which is given to the Ministry of Defense and is used and serviced at the expense of the budget.

The Ministry of Defense appears to be a buyer of weapons. I say appears to be because it has bought them with our money. Let us imagine that the U.S. defense secretary is a buyer. He buys tanks. For currency. A tank costs 1 million rubles [R] and $1 million. To whom is it more profitable to sell it? Hence, economic conversion means turning the military-industrial complex into an export sector for a transitional period, when we are lying on the bottom of the economic trough. For the credits which the world's richest countries are now giving us are less than the sums that we can earn ourselves!

So, export weapons. Which ones? Of course not nuclear ones. Not chemical ones. But why not sell exclusively defensive weapons? Anti-aircraft complexes, tracking equipment, satellites? One of the plants in Udmurtia produces antiaircraft complexes. According to specialists' assessments, this machine is one of the best in the world. Our traders in weapons say: We will sell on the international market as many as you can give us. For $12 million each, while our Ministry of Defense paid the plant R4 million.

This is a source of funding for conversion! In addition to antiaircraft complexes, the former Ministry of the Defense Industry can provide the Nikonov-designed assault rifle, the best of this type in the world. It is replacing the Kalashnikov assault rifle and is now going into series production. The former Ministry of General Machine Building can put satellites into orbit. Both mean hundreds of millions of dollars. By trading in enriched uranium for nuclear electric power stations, the Russian Ministry of Atomic Power Engineering and Industry is also capable of earning up to $800 million a year.

Of course, it is possible to strike a pose as a pacifist and declare: It is not good to trade in weapons...

[Panov] It really is hard to argue with that.

[Maley] I too understand this. But the thing is that the weapons market does exist and will exist. Weapons are produced and sold by highly moral Germans and by Americans concerned about human rights. Why cannot we do likewise, finding ourselves in a very grave crisis? It is immoral to trade in weapons directed against people. But I tell you it is moral to trade in artillery pieces, for example, which are not directed against people.

[Panov] Who can guarantee that our guns will not, after all, be turned against people?

[Maley] Take any nonfighting army of a neutral country... Sweden, let us assume. It does not fight, but it must train—by firing guns on test ranges. Guns wear out, shells are expended. Is it moral or immoral to supply ammunition and weapons to such an army? Rich countries do not consider it immoral. Since we have gotten into a catastrophic situation, we too must not consider it immoral... Although, of course, we must not impose a moral choice on people. Let everyone decide for himself. If he decides that he does not want to make instruments of murder, he will become a farmer, move to a different plant...

[Panov] It is easy to say that. Where can people move to in that Udmurt town where antiaircraft complexes are made? For there is only one plant there.

[Maley] So, then, is it moral to starve these people to death? They do not have the wherewithal to live. They have come under physical conversion, and essentially it is necessary to halt production there... I assure you that I have repeatedly asked myself these questions. I have resolved them for myself. Rather, I have separated them. Because mankind, to all appearances, will never stop making instruments of murder.

[Panov] All the same, your concept is designed not for eternity but for a transitional period. Is it possible to say how long it will last?

[Maley] Three or four years. Until the slide stops. The addition which the military-industrial complex will make to the budget will prove not at all superfluous. It is also very important that it will come down from the position where it is maintained from the budget and move over to self-sufficiency.

[Panov] Then it will be hard to stop and to renounce the dollars made from weapons. For, if that same Nikonov assault rifle sells like hot cakes...

[Maley] There is specialization among producers of weapons in the world. Why should we not occupy a strong place in the market for hunting rifles or sporting weapons? Defensive antiaircraft weapons? Let the Russian Supreme Soviet or even the United Nations impose a ban on deliveries to certain parts of the globe. But it is possible to sell weapons to others. What of armored personnel carriers, all-terrain vehicles, hovercraft? A normal commodity.

[Panov] Tell me, Mikhail Dmitriyevich, have we not already been squeezed from the international market?

[Maley] We are losing it. We are leaving it voluntarily. Who is taking our place? Czechs, Poles, and Chinese are very active, working under licenses from us. It is interesting that Ukraine will be in serious competition with Russia on the world tank market. But the former republics of the Union are now foreign buyers for Russia too, you know.

On the other hand, the market still has to be won. For our rockets to launch other people's satellites, it is necessary to lift the COCOM [Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls] restrictions. Will the

Americans agree to this? The COCOM staffs are growing, so they declare, to control sales of weapons to small countries, but it can turn against us. In order to make money out of enriched uranium, it is necessary to secure an increase in the international export quota from 5 percent, as now, to some 20 percent.

[Panov] That is, not everything is so simple. Not to mention the moral aspect of the matter. As far as I know, however, there are no other workable conversion programs.

[Maley] You are absolutely right. The Union program was based on the word "give." They allocated so many billions for a simplistic conversion. But, I repeat, these rubles do not exist. What program can there be when the military doctrine has still not been defined? There are six hulls of nuclear-powered submarines on the stocks in Severodvinsk. What is to be done with them? Do we need them or not? Will they plow the World Ocean, as before, or is this pointless now? Then they must be converted into underwater tankers. There are lots of satellites in space. Will they keep watch on the territory of a likely enemy, or does he no longer exist? If he does not, why have so many satellites? When the military doctrine emerges, it will become clear which production processes unequivocally come under conversion and which should be preserved and modernized in the interests of the future Russian army.

[Panov] Simultaneously with the preservation and modernization of defense plants, defense consciousness is being preserved and modernized. The task of the demilitarization of the economy and also of the country as a whole is being postponed until the indefinite future or, quite honestly, being eliminated altogether. Your concept must appeal to the generals—those in the army as well as those in civilian life. If, of course, we traditionally consider the military-industrial complex to be a conservative force. But is this so? How just is the persistent opinion that the military-industrial complex is reactionary?

[Maley] Our most competent and talented people are concentrated there, but also the most hide-bound. Shock therapy is particularly painful for them. But I would divide them up into two clear categories. Some are really ready for the market and do not want to obey the rigid diktat of ministries anymore. They are terribly offended when they are used to intimidate the people. Are they really not Russians, and do they really not want, like all people, to lead a richer life and to feed and dress themselves better? When directors of defense plants finally understand what has to be done, they will become a real economic force. A political one too. But approximately one-third totally reject what is happening in the country. They are incapable of joining the market economy or of thinking and acting under conditions of competition. Naturally, they are opponents. But they are being inexorably flushed out of directorial posts. On the whole, the process of improving the leadership of the military-industrial complex is taking place.

[Panov] Good. Let us assume that the concept of economic conversion is adopted. What is the mechanism for realizing it?

[Maley] Specialists conduct marketing and report that it is possible to sell so many antiaircraft complexes. The plant is obliged to meet the market need in full. This is the simplest case. If, let us assume, there is no demand for traditional products, but it is possible to reprofile the enterprise to produce a different output for export, then it is reprofiled. Exports are unequivocally preferred—they are 100 times more profitable. Finally, if it comes to light that the plant is not capable of working for export, physical conversion is at once carried out there, and it is privatized so as not to hang round the taxpayer's neck.

[Panov] What about supplying the Commonwealth's army? For it will be forced to buy weapons at world prices. For currency.

[Maley] Yes. But why must Russian plants sell weapons to the Commonwealth's Joint Army at prices that are 100 times lower? It would be another matter if the army were Russian. But it wishes to be above the state, you know...

[Panov] That is a strong argument... The military-industrial complex is splitting up. Those who produce guns and those who fire them are finding different interests. However, it cannot be ruled out that the military-industrial complex will close ranks and not allow a split. As a result, the currency earned by weapons manufacturers will once again reach the army through the usual channels of state redistribution. Therefore it is very important who will control these funds and how.

[Maley] A low-interest federal conversion fund is needed. To fund the tackling of the entire problem as a whole and very diverse projects. Deductions from the sale of weapons—in both currency and rubles—will go there. Enterprises to be converted will be able to receive from it one-off financial transfusions of the order of R500 million. As a commercial organization, the fund must not be part of the government structure. Let it operate independently, under the control of the Supreme Soviet, let us assume. Precisely the fund will be able to realize the law on conversion.

[Panov] But you evaluated the law as contradictory. Moreover, there are no analogous laws in developed countries. Do we need it? Or is this lawmaking for the sake of lawmaking?

[Maley] The law gives at least some guarantees. According to it, an enterprise is automatically proclaimed a conversion enterprise as soon as the army reduces the volume of the order. It is impossible to understand now whether the army needs arms of a certain type and, accordingly, the capacities to produce them. The military either stays silent or makes a purely formal reply.

When it comes right down to it, the law is not needed. A military doctrine is needed. A decision is needed on the formation of a federal fund. And on the start of economic conversion.

[Panov] When can it be expected?

[Maley] I have received the president's "go-ahead" to realize the concept in Udmurtia. There we will try out the path of economic conversion, even if all the rest of the Federation takes the hopeless simplistic path.

PRAVDA Distribution Problems Noted

PM0303112992 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Mar 92 p 1

[Feature consisting of letter from PRAVDA journalists' collective to readers and Valeriy Miroshnichenko report from Stavropol and Nikolay Senchev report from Ulyanovsk]

[Text] Dear PRAVDA readers!

PRAVDA did not reach you on Monday [2 March]. We have been obliged to reduce the number of times the newspaper is published. Now PRAVDA will be published on Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday. In the next few months there will have to be a resubscription, of which the editorial office will notify you.

All this is extremely distressing. But there is no other way out. Prices for the newspaper's publication have increased tens of times over. And they will grow further. There is a planned economic suffocation of the free, independent press, including PRAVDA. Not even a light drizzle of subsidies will rain on us: That is the privilege only of the official Russian press. First some of its premises were taken from the editorial office. Now it is obviously the turn of excluding PRAVDA completely from society's political life. So far we are holding out, so far we are not giving in, although we have been obliged to "shrink."

Our only hope is with you, our readers. We realize how hard it is for you today. Your material support will determine whether PRAVDA will survive or fold up its banners in its 80th year.

Banking details for the PRAVDA support fund: routing number 291230, account number 000608901, Kirovskiy branch of the International Investment Bank, 57/65 Novoslobodskaya Street, Moscow 103055.

Money can also be sent by mail transfer to the following address: PRAVDA editorial office, 24, PRAVDA Street, A-137 Moscow special urban postal collection, 125867/

[signed] The PRAVDA journalists' collective.

'Rospechat' Causes Sorrow

During a recent working trip to Stavropol Kray I noticed a strange phenomenon: The central Russian publications were virtually absent in the kiosks. And irrespective of orientation or political reputation. A kind of tacit brotherhood.

G.I. Molchanova, chief of the Georgiyevskiy Rayon division of "Rospechat" [Russian main administration for the distribution of publications], had "glad tidings:" Do not even bother looking for your PRAVDA, for KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, or MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI—apart from 10 copies of MODELI SEZONA of the 41 central publications for February not one has been ordered. Seeing the unvoiced question in my eyes, she explained: A letter came from the kray "Rospechat" state enterprise giving the new prices for publications in retail trade. Thus it was suggested that in February a copy of PRAVDA be sold for 4 rubles, 46 kopeks, a copy of IZVESTIYA for 3 rubles, 81 kopeks, and a copy of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA for 2 rubles 91 kopeks. They have dealt "strongly" with other popular newspapers: LITERATURNAYA GAZETA costs 8 rubles, 67 kopeks, ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 2 rubles 46 kopeks, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 rubles 88 kopeks, SOBESEDNIK 4 rubles 70 kopeks, NEDELYA 5 rubles 62 kopeks, KOMMERSANT 10 rubles 77 kopeks, ROSSIYA 4 rubles 57 kopeks, and MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI 5 rubles 4 kopeks.

And if even at January's considerably lower prices the rayon division had to write off periodical publications for 2,300 rubles [R], in February this problem no longer arose. There is a similar situation in other rayons of the kray.

The next person I talked to was L.V. Osipov, chief of the Stavropol Kray "Rospechat." It is true that we did not learn much new here. Apart from the fact that the "base" price was determined by the "Rospechat" central retail subscription agency in a telegram 28 January and that the Stavropol officials themselves have just kopeks left from each copy.

What "black hole" is causing the disappearance not of kopeks but of the considerably larger sums "extorted" by the Moscow central retail subscription agency if, for instance, the initial price of PRAVDA hovers somewhere in the region of R1? We tried to get to the bottom of this mystery together with L.N. Bogdan, one of the agency's competent specialists.

To be honest, the arguments we heard did not convince us. Judge for yourselves: What fair price formation can there be if, for instance, SOBESEDNIK, which is a polychrome publication and, incidentally, a large-format one, costs virtually the same as the black and white PRAVDA? And what kind of work methods are they when editorial offices are among the last to learn of such innovations by the communications workers placing newspapers on the verge of destruction?

There was also a direct question: For what specific services does the "Rospechat" central retail subscription agency take its sizeable payment, after all the periodical press is brought direct to the reader by the rayon, city, and, in party, oblast and kray enterprises. Here too we received no sensible answer.

Indeed, do we need offices like the "Rospechat" central retail subscription agency at all? PRAVDA at least has taken the path of concluding direct contracts with distributors locally. God grant that we can manage without parasi... forgive me, without intermediaries. [Miroshnichenko report ends]

PRAVDA in Ulyanovsk Kiosks

Ulyanovsk—After a long break PRAVDA has reappeared in Ulyanovsk's kiosks—costing 1 ruble 25 kopeks a copy.

"We concluded a direct contact with the local publishing house on the distribution of PRAVDA," says G. Terentyev, chief of the oblast "Soyuzpechat" agency. "If there is trade on the side, we shall increase the number of retail copies published."

The Ulyanovsk people, worried by the disappearance of our newspaper from the kiosks, are telephoning to the correspondents' point and offering their suggestions for distribution. For instance, the workers at the aviation industry complex are prepared to collect PRAVDA from the printers and sell it at the plant gates and on trams and buses. What will the publishers' reply be to that?

Yeltsin Decree's Impact on Paper Sales Weighed

PM0403111792 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 3 Mar 92 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report under the "Business Chronicle" rubric: "The Paper Market: Anxious Expectations"]

[Text] The decree of the Russian Federation president restricting trade in paper at free prices could in the very near future produce feverish trading on the exchanges—this is the conclusion toward which experts of the Russian Paper Exchange incline.

In their opinion, the increase in the size of the state order with a simultaneous freezing of prices will lead to the amount of paper sold through the exchanges being roughly halved, while prices will correspondingly grow. Moreover, a considerable amount of paper could go into channels outside the exchanges, including the black market.

Since, in the prevailing situation, no increase in paper output can be counted on in the foreseeable future, to preserve exchange turnover and their own viability the "paper" exchanges will clearly have to follow the well-trodden path of increasing supplies of paper to the external market, which could lead to a further increase in prices.

State Employees Receive 45% Pay Increase

LD0103155692 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 1 Mar 92

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] According to press reports, President Yeltsin has signed instructions on increasing the basic wage rate and salaries of the post of white- and blue-collar workers in state-subsidized enterprises and institutions by approximatelay 45 percent as of 1 March. This increase concerns only those workers not affected by January's 90 percent wage increase.

Decree Establishes Entrepreneurship Council

OW0303175392 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1358 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Boris Yeltsin has signed a decree on the institution of the president's council for entrepreneurship. It consists of V. Tikhonov, K. Zazulin, M. Masarskiy, K. Borovoy, I. Weinberg and other leaders of major commercial, banking and exchange associations of the republic. The council is expected to analyze the laws related to entrepreneurship and draft corresponding recommendations to the government.

Deputy Finance Minister Discusses Taxation

LD0303215792 Moscow TASS in English 1019 GMT 3 Mar 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Pyotr Tsyrendorzhiyev]

[Text] Moscow March 3—A heavy burden of taxes will be experienced for some time by enterprises and citizens, Russian Federation Deputy Finance Minister Sergey Gorbachev believes.

He told ITAR-TASS that as distinct from the previous union law on the fundamentals of taxation, the new Russian law "is aimed at expanding the rights of local Russian authorities". Regarding the increase of the number of taxes levied, Sergey Gorbachev explained this by the changed situation in the country and the emergence of private property alongside state property.

The law clearly subdivides taxes according to different levels of power. There will be 15 federal taxes, four republican and territorial taxes, and 22 local taxes. It has been stipulated that only seven of federal taxes go directly to the state Russian budgets. Other taxes either play the regulating role and are distributed between different kinds of budget, or go to special extrabudgetary foundations or to local budgets.

Taxes that are to be levied by republics, territories, regions and autonomous formations are payments for the use of natural resources and property and can rightly be taken to the budget only after considering specific factors in definite regions, he said. In accordance with the new law, local taxes are closer geared to the municipal infrastructure and "it would be unrealistic to regulate them from above".

The Russian Deputy Finance Minister said that the tax on profit remained at the same level as in the previous union law, 32 percent.

He also expressed the opinion that taxation on entrepreneurs had become more liberal. The part of the profit that is channeled for the manufacture of consumer goods, food, medicines, equipment for conversion of the defence industry to civilian uses and for the development of the oil and coal industry is exempt from taxation.

Sergey Gorbachev said that tax rebates on investments and credits may be introduced in the current year. "I believe that we shall take this step this year", he said. "We estimate it to cost over 62 billion rubles to the state budget. Now that the idea of reducing the budgetary deficit to the minimum is being implemented, this decision is unrealistic. But when the economic reform is being implemented, tax legislation will be readjusted by the government in accordance with the situation".

Russian Taxation Service Chief Briefs Press

PM0303160592 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 2

[Vasiliy Kononenko report: "Collecting Taxes in Russia Proving Difficult"]

[Text] At the present time the Russian tax service has around 60,000 tax inspectors on its staff. The have extensive rights including the use of sanctions ranging as far as suspending the financial activity of law-breaking enterprises. This was reported at a news conference on 26 February by I. Lazarev, leader of the Russian State Tax Service.

Financial checks of enterprises and commercial structures last year uncovered 10.6 billion rubles—a considerable addition to the Russian budget. Nevertheless, when answering your IZVESTIYA correspondent's questions, I. Lazarev acknowledged that at present the tax service is incapable of uncovering all cases of income concealment. How much money is being concealed? According to world estimates the figure varies from 10-30 percent. The figure is probably higher in our country, the leader of the main tax service said. In this connection territorial teams are being reinforced by cadres which will conduct tax investigations more vigorously.

It was also reported at the news conference that the conflict situation in the "MMM" cooperative was due to the fact that when the inspectors arrived to conduct a routine inspection they were effectively told to clear off. With the militia's help the necessary documents were taken away and the examination is now being carried out. I. Lazarev told journalists that the income declaration completed by citizens when carrying out major purchases had not proved worthwhile and the tax service has proposed that it be rescinded.

Review of Economic Reform Program

OW0103183892 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1438 GMT 1 Mar 92

[From the "Soviet Business Report"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At a meeting on 27 February, the Russian government approved a program for economic reform in 1992. "Interfax" will print accounts of this document.

A. THE ECONOMY AT THE BEGINNING OF 1992

After most fixed prices were lifted on 2 January, about 90% of consumer prices and 80% of industrial prices were freed. The average price level rose in January by 3.5 times. In February, however, the rate of inflation was significantly slowed.

In order to slow the growth of inflation, the government intends to take the following steps:
—develop competition and actively privatize. In 1992 there are plans to privatize 50% of the building supply industry, wholesale trade and social food services; 60% of the food industry, agriculture and retail trade, and 70% of light industry, construction and transportation.
—have strict budget policies. Most importantly, in the first quarter of 1992, the deficit of the republican budget must be reduced to 1% of gross national product (in 1991 the deficit was more than 20% of GNP). According to international norms, (by which foreign financing is excluded from revenues but includes expenditures to service the state's foreign debt) the budget deficit was at first estimated to be 9% of GNP, but it could grow to more than 10%.
—have a stricter monetary policy. In the first quarter of 1992 the Central Bank of Russia increased the credit interest rate to 20% for commercial banks and also increased the necessary reserve amount held by banks to 20%.

Russia will continue to service the foreign debt and "the government intends to pay off the debt." In order to do this, a system of regulating the transfer of funds from Vneshtorgbank Russia to Vneshekonombank USSR was introduced in February. However, the document says that "at the present time it is impossible to completely cover interest payments.

B. GOVERNMENT PROGRAM FROM APRIL 1 THROUGH 31 DECEMBER 1992

This program aims at significantly lowering the rate of inflation by the end of 1992; doing everything possible to counteract drops in productivity; and bringing about "a fundamental improvement in the international economic situation."

Policies concerning prices and inflation. By the end of March, prices on all goods including raw materials will be freed. The only exceptions will be for housing, community services and public transportation.

Prices for fuel and energy will be freed by 20 April 1992. The government intends to increase the price of crude oil, which at the start of the year was 350 rub. [rubles]/ton, to between 2000-2500 rubles per ton. When the ruble exchange rate reaches 50 rubles to the dollar, the government's goal, this would mean that internal prices had reached a level of more than one third of world market prices. At the same time, export duties for energy will be reconsidered by 1 January 1993 so that internal prices will be about ⅔ of world market prices.

Due to "total" price liberalization, the overall price level will rise in April by 50-75%. However, through hard financial and revenue policies, the government intends to lower the average monthly rate of inflation to between 1-3% by the fourth quarter of 1992.

Social welfare system. The government is planning to do the following:
—set a ceiling on budget expenditures for consumer subsidies;
—introduce a system of family benefits for those with low incomes;
—change benefit rates for the unemployed no later than 1 June 1992 (normal benefits will not exceed 75% of minimum wage);
—pensions and benefits for social insurance will be limited to the Pension Fund and the Fund for Social Insurance's own means. The government does not intend to subsidize these funds in 1992.

Financial policy. The main goal here is to balance the budget and liquidate the budget deficit by the fourth quarter.

The government plans to reduce the total volume of expenditures to 5% of GNP. Subsidies to enterprises will also be reduced by 1.5% in the fourth quarter of 1992. The government intends to "avoid the harsh indexation of wages, in budgeted organizations" and expenditures for such organizations will grow not by more than 90% of the growth of the fund of wages in the material sector.

Certain measures are being considered to increase budget revenues:
1) set a value added tax on all goods;
2) replace the existing system of required sales of hard currency earnings with the prevailing exchange rate; and replace existing export duties with one regime of taxation for energy exports;
3) by 1 July 1992 to introduce one customs tariff with an average level of 15% of the stated price;
4) introduce additional taxes on average of about 50% of internal prices for oil and natural gas from the moment of price liberalization;
5) reduce the number of tax privileges for different regions, branches and enterprises;
6) include value added tax and excise tax on imports as of 1 July 1992.

To increase control over the budget by the end of the year, the Exchequer will operate within the Ministry of Finances.

Monetary policy remains linked to faith in the ruble. A rise in the volume of credits will correspond to the rate of inflation and the growth of pure hard currency reserves. The government also intends to bring credit rates at the Central Bank of Russia to a realistic and positive level, thus ending subsidies to enterprises received through special interest rates. In order to do this, in the first quarter of the year, a credit interest limit was set at 15% by the Central Bank of Russia to commercial banks. Starting April 1, a "more realistic" interest rate on the internal debt will be paid.

The Central Bank of Russia intends to control the licensing of banking activities more effectively in order to prevent the creation of high numbers of banks. Special measures will be taken to provide facile inter-republic payments.

Revenues policy. The government "is ready if necessary to introduce measures to prevent excessive wage growth," through introducing a tax on its super-normative growth. The tax will be paid out of the profits of the enterprise before paying other taxes and will not be included in the price of the product.

Foreign economic policy. The government intends "as soon as possible to introduce a system of one fixed exchange rate for the ruble." By 20 April, the transfer to the system of two exchange rates will be completed. There will be one floating exchange rate for current operations, including the transfer of interest and dividends, and a second separate fixed exchange rate for moving capital (which will be lifted in the future).

Enterprises will still be required to sell 30% of their hard currency profits at the market exchange rate. Export, customs, which will be collected either in rubles or hard currency, will eat up 20% of an enterprise's hard currency profits. Parallel to this, the government will guarantee the "absolute free access to foreign currency for importers and foreign investors to convert dividends and profits.

By March 15 the government plans to:
—allow all empowered banks to hold currency auctions and allow them to open hard currency exchange points anywhere on Russian territory;
—allow inter-bank currency trading at first twice a week and then on a daily basis;
—lift limits on the exchange rate;

—allow some non-residents to buy and sell currency on the inter-bank market;
—give banks the right to have hard currency accounts.

However, despite the proposed strict measures in financing and postponing payments for the foreign debt, demands on the Russian economy for foreign financing, according to the government, will remain high.

Economic relations among the former republics of the USSR. The government intends to "take any measures to preserve the common economic space" and "remove inter-state trade barriers."

Official Outlines Measures To Strengthen Ruble

PM0203152492 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with A. Potemkin, chief of the Russian Central Bank International Operations Administration, by I. Zhagel; place and date not given: "We Are Not Trying To Artificially Boost the Ruble, Claims A. Potemkin, Chief of the Russian Central Bank International Operations Administration"]

[Text] Government advisers are generally calling the rise in the ruble-dollar rate one of the main signs of an incipient economic improvement. However, the opinion is often expressed in the mass media that this process has been artificially organized and that a new fall in the rate of our currency can be expected soon.

[Zhagel] Aleksandr Ivanovich, just what is behind the ruble's rise—a major ploy by a government trying to improve its standing, or some kind of objective process?

[Potemkin] We have all been living for so long in an unrealistic world that any normal processes seem abnormal to us. And the abnormal rate of 230 rubles [R] to the dollar seems entirely objective, even though it could only exist in a distorted pricing system and in the context of massive state orders—that is, in a centralized goods distribution system. Under these circumstances the ruble has not been equivalent to any material assets, and its rate has been set not by the real state of the economy, but by emotions and inflationary expectations.

Here is an example: In late October and early November last year the rate fluctuated for a long time around the level of R110 to the dollar. However, following the announcement of the forthcoming price liberalization it slumped sharply—even though the economic situation was not changing this quickly—and in January reached the record rate of R230 to the dollar. This was precisely because of increasing inflationary expectations.

Now we are starting to get back to a commonsense economy, and the first step in this direction was price liberalization. Of course, the cost of raw and other materials and end products have increased considerably, but goods have started appearing on free sale rather than being distributed. This means that a demand for the ruble has emerged and its rate has started to rise correspondingly.

[Zhagel] Nonetheless, the skeptics' arguments are very weighty: The ruble cannot strengthen while production volumes are simultaneously falling.

[Potemkin] Once again I would repeat that the current rise in the ruble should not be linked to any improvement or deterioration in industrial performance, the ruble is simply getting its real value back. And we are not trying to boost the rate artificially—as many people are alleging. You can see the volume of Russian Central Bank intervention—just $2-3 million a week. This level of intervention cannot substantially alter the situation on the foreign exchanges, but it could help to dampen down the kinds of sudden surges which had previously been followed by hysterical dollar-buying.

It seems to me that it is important to remember something else too: Usually the problem of supporting the ruble is linked with the problem of the supply of foreign currency to the free market. But the rate will be also be positively influenced by various measures to tie up the excess money supply that is hanging over the currency market. The most effective measure in this regard would be the privatization program, which is likely to attract substantial funds. So that when we talk about the ruble's position in the near future we need to take this factor into account as well.

[Zhagel] Many predictions can currently be heard about what the ruble rate will be in the very near future. What do you—as the country's chief foreign exchange dealer, as it were—think about this?

[Potemkin] I make no forecasts myself and I take a skeptical view of similar assessments made by others. Nobody today can say how large the budget deficits will be in Russia or in the other states in the first quarter or first half. We do not know if the governments will manage to withstand the onslaught of trade union demands for pay rises. Nobody knows what prices will be like in one, two, or three months' time. Yet this all affects the state of our monetary unit. So making forecasts in this situation is futile. I will say only that, in my view, the ruble rate has not yet found its real level and that it will go on rising for some time yet.

[Zhagel] What foreign exchange resources will be available to the Russian Central Bank to stabilize the ruble this year?

[Potemkin] As is well known, we receive from exporters a 10-percent levy payable into a special fund for currency intervention in the free market. So you can work out our potential for yourself. If total exports in 1992 reach the level of the average annual indicators for the past few years, then our fund could expect to receive $1-2 billion.

Admittedly, there is a problem collecting the money. Many enterprises are hanging on to these payments, in the hope of avoiding them altogether. Regrettably, after 1991, when there was confusion over union and republic laws, many people have taken the view that the nonfulfillment of existing rules is practically a virtue. We therefore intend in the near future to carry out the necessary check, in conjunction with a number of other organizations, and this will be accompanied by the imposition of fines.

[Zhagel] It is well known that many enterprises and organizations, in order not to pay taxes, leave the foreign currency they have earned in accounts in foreign banks. What is the scale of this process now and what losses are we sustaining here?

[Potemkin] The Washington Institute of International Finance recently published a report estimating the funds concealed in our enterprises' accounts abroad at $14 billion. But that is, so to speak, an extreme estimate. We think we are talking about a total of not more than $3 billion dollars. However, even this money would be extremely useful to us within the country, whereas as it is, we are in effect financing someone else's economy out of our meager resources.

I would like to remind you that keeping currency in this way is illegal. Under the president's Decree "On the Formation of the Russian Federation Republic Currency Reserve," all currency earnings from exports are subject to compulsory payment into authorized banks on Russian territory. For violating this procedure enterprises will be subject to a fine equivalent to the whole amount of currency earnings concealed. And those who have accounts abroad must transfer the money into the country within three months. Incidentally, the decree came out on 30 December 1991, so the three months have not yet expired, but not much time is left.

[Zhagel] A fine is a forcible measure. But as well as a stick, there should be a carrot, otherwise the money will stay abroad.

[Potemkin] I agree. And we are trying to provide incentives for enterprises to import foreign currency. Let me remind you that only recently they contributed to the state up to 70-80 percent of their currency, and as much as 90 percent in the case of raw materials sectors. And the state was paying them approximately R1.8 per dollar. Now the contribution levels have been reduced to 40 percent, and even this only applies to enterprises in the fuel and raw materials complex and does not affect exports of machines, equipment, and other finished products. And now the enterprise receives R55 per dollar, that is, nearly 30 times more than before. So even with our meager financial resources, the state is trying to accommodate the exporters.

There is another factor which has made enterprises avoid transferring money, especially in the second half of last year. The vast majority of foreign currency accounts were at the USSR Vneshekonombank [Bank for Foreign Economic Activity], and by then it was already on the brink of collapse. It was allowing the government to get its hands on other people's money, and everyone knew it could not go on like that for long.

The Vneshekonombank is now being reorganized, and I think in time it will be able to work properly with clients. But in addition, there are now around 200 banks with licenses to carry out currency operations. So the enterprises now have a choice of where to keep their funds.

All the above also applies to individuals. We will strive to ensure that all the currency resources belonging to them are kept in our own country's banks. Everyone will gain from this, since such measures will strengthen our ruble.

Compensating Depositors To Cost R92 Billion

PM0303142192 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Mar 92 p 1

[ITAR-TASS correspondent Petr Tsyrendorzhiyev report: "Compensation for Deposits To Be Paid From 30 March"]

[Text] Moscow, 2 Mar—The restrictions on the Russian Savings Bank paying out 40-percent compensation to depositors from the population following last April's price rises have been lifted. As of 30 March the Russian Federation Government will allow the bank to make the payments. We would recall that, under the USSR presidential decree of 22 March 1991, it had been planned to issue the revalued deposits after three years. But now every depositor will be able to have free use of this money.

"This will cost the Russian state budget 92 billion rubles," Vladimir Mitichkin, vice president of the Savings Bank, told this ITAR-TASS correspondent.

Railroad Union Vows Worker Benefit Protection

OW0303172592 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1557 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] An independent trade union of railroad workers and builders was founded in Moscow on Tuesday [3 March].

According to its leader Ivan Shenkevich, the new union intends to work "for a balance of rights and duties between the union and the government, paying special attention to additional social and economic benefits for the personnel."

Independent rail worker trade unions are under formation in all the republics of the former USSR. A consultative council is expected to be set up by the end of March to coordinate their efforts.

Workers Movement Calls For Popular Assembly

OW0203215192 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1612 GMT 2 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Grass roots delegates from cities, regions and republics, elected by their labour staffs, will gather in Moscow's Manezh square on at 17:00 on March 17 for a national popular assembly.

An appeal issued on Monday [2 March] by the Workers' Russia movement says that the purpose of the assembly will be to confirm the people's choice made in the referendum of March 17 1991 in order to put an end to policies detrimental to the people's interests and adopt a program for ending the crisis in the country. The organizers say that the assembly would endorse a "head of state and government of the USSR", to be nominated by the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR earlier in the day.

'Moscow Tribune' Fears Communist Influences

MK0303143492 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 3 Mar 92 p 2

[Yelena Tregubova report: "Democrats: Moscow Intelligentsia Demands Decommunization of Whole Country"]

[Text] The routine session of the "Moscow Tribune" [Moskovskaya Tribuna] club held 1 March in the Moscow Soviet's Marble Hall proved to be a memorial—the founders of "Moscow Tribune," Mikhail Volkenshteyn and Stella Oleynikova-Volkenshteyn, died quite recently. The session's participants decided to support the appeal from the "April" Moscow writer's organization and the Russian Antifascist Center regarding the need to create a broad antifascist front in Russia. According to Alla Gerber, setting up this kind of front will be the best way to commemorate people who "devoted a great deal of effort to eliminating the "communist and fascist danger." [quotation marks as received]

Valentin Oskotskiy recalled that the last session of the "Moscow Tribune" board held in Oleynikova-Volkenshteyn's home decided to join with some Russian deputies in demanding that parliamentary hearings be held to investigate and make a legal assessment of the activity of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and CPSU. Oskotskiy stressed that it is important to make a legal assessment of this organization's antistate activity now that the "party nomenklatura has entered into an alliance with national-patriotic organizations, those being the distinguishing features of national-socialism." Pointing out that the new right-wingers already have enough supporters to destabilize the situation in the country once and for all, Lev Ponomarev said that he considers it particularly important to hold parliamentary hearings most speedily in order to finally give people truthful information.

"Moscow Tribune" is afraid that pro-communist parties and organizations and their allies will seize the political initiative owing to the crisis within the democratic movement brought about by the split within "Democratic Russia," its leaders' political games, the rapid bureaucratization of the democratic apparatus, and the belated response to the changing mood in society. Pointing out the real danger of a revival of totalitarianism, members of the "Moscow Tribune" club are convinced that the intelligentsia's most important cause now is to help all democratic forces to unite.

Democratic Leaders 'Second-Rate Politicians'

MK0303134892 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 3 Mar 92 p 2

[Vladimir Todres report: "DRM [Movement for Democratic Reforms]: DRM Considers Petrakov Radical"]

[Text] Only two of June's magnificent nine founders of the DRM [Movement for Democratic Reforms]—Arkadiy Volskiy and Nikolay Petrakov—went to 29 February's routine session of the movement's Political Council. Its prospects are becoming increasingly dubious: From the very outset they were based not on mass support or a ramified structure, but on the political clout of the top men. However, the reformers with the greatest status have gone about their own business and the DRM's current leaders are good, respected people, but, regrettably, second-rate politicians...

Having backed the DRM in better times, they have now found themselves in a strange situation: The players in "Gorbachev's team" are rapidly becoming private individuals, while Gavriil Popov has decided to go it alone and experiment with Russian "Democratic Reformers." The uncertain situation is dictating restrained behavior: Only the DRM's "founding fathers," who have a secure fallback position, venture to make radical assessments.

"I have come to have profound doubts as to the government's course. It has lost its bearings. We might have considered the question of demanding its resignation," Nikolay Petrakov appealed, and then demanded that approaches to agrarian reform, privatization, and—in particular—conversion of the military-industrial complex be reviewed. In his opinion, unskilled labor is once again gaining higher remuneration than skilled labor and therefore a "wage coefficient must be introduced." "Market structures are parasitizing on the market: Exchanges are not doing what they should be doing." The academician (who evidently harbored a personal grudge against the cabinet) said "we have had enough bowing and scraping to the government," otherwise "we will not be seen as an opposition."

However, the current DRM, unlike its past incarnation, is not concerned with preserving its available political clout until better times (and keeping aloof from Gaydar's "team of condemned men") but with gaining this political clout without falling out with anyone. Petrakov received a long response from government adviser Yevgeniy Yasin, who received a special invitation to the Political Council, and the meeting then decided to set up a group to formulate the DRM's economic concept.

Volskiy and Petrakov waited until the recess and then left. The orphaned Political Council spoke about Ukrainian-Russian relations and decided once again to "decide its position later." Relations between the "big DRM" and its Russian younger brother are equally vague: Gavriil Popov did not come to the meeting and therefore the question of the results of the constituent congress of the Russian Movement for Democratic Reforms (which is perhaps the main issue for the DRM) was not even discussed.

Supreme Soviet

Parliament Discusses Foreign Policy Tasks

LD0303152492 Moscow TASS in English 1457 GMT 3 Mar 92

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Aleksey Tabachnikov]

[Text] Moscow March 3 TASS—The main tasks of Russian foreign policy will include the overcoming of social and economic crisis, revitalising the state, and entering the world community. These goals were formulated in a memo issued by the Russian Foreign Ministry under the title "on the concept of Russian foreign policy" and discussed at the session of the Parliamentary Legislation Committee.

Relations with the nearest neighbouring states, optimal activity of the CIS and economic and cultural unity of the Commonwealth are described as top priority issues in foreign policy.

The transition from confrontation to partnership will be accomplished in relations with the USA. Emphasis in relations with Western Europe will be placed on trade, economy and finance, according to the concept.

Another important task is described as preventing "the erosion of economic ties with East European countries and to secure transition to equal and mutually beneficial relations" with them. Russia is still to determine its own eastern policy but its main objectives are determined as stability and parity on "eastern borders" and in the Asian Pacific region.

Discussions over the document are under way and amendments will be introduced into the text after hearings in parliamentary committees.

Deputies Sign Appeal on Tatarstan Referendum

OW0303171792 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1557 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Fifty People's Deputies of the Russian Federation have signed an appeal to Russia's Constitutional Court to check whether the Tatar Supreme Soviet's decision to hold a referendum on the republic's political self-determination is consistent with the constitution. The appeal is expected to be sent to the Constitutional Court on Wednesday [3 March]. According to IF's [INTERFAX's] sources, among those who signed it were Nikolay Medvedev, Oleg Rumyantsev, Vladimir Lysenko, Viktor Sheinis and other parliamentarians.

Tatar Parliament Head Meets Russian Deputies

LD0403002992 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1700 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Report by V. Budnikov from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] The forthcoming referendum in Tatarstan on the latter's membership in the Russian Federation has stirred up Russian deputies. Today they met at the Russian White House with Farid Amelshev [name as heard], chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Tatarstan.

Tatarstan cannot disappear into space or drop to the center of the earth. No single leader of Tatarstan has spoken about secession from the Russian Federation. The question is not posed this way, and it will not be posed like this, Amelshin stated. However, he did not miss the opportunity to drop a fly in the ointment, saying that none of the proposed constitutional drafts suits Tatarstan. It is known that a group of deputies has already addressed the Constitutional Court of Russia urging it to tackle the issue of the legality of holding a referendum in Tatarstan. Russian deputies believe that the idea of a referendum was born in the stillness of offices and was not initiated by people.

Draft Laws on Chechen-Ingushetia Discussed

LD0303202292 Moscow POSTFACTUM in English 1704 GMT 2 Mar 92

[From the "Politics" section]

[Text] The draft laws of the Russian Federation on the transformation of the Chechen-Ingush Republic integrated in the Russian Federation and on the restoration of the Karachaevo autonomous region integrated in the Russian Federation have been submitted for discussion to the committees and commissions of the Russian Parliament.

On March 2 the Presidium of the Russian Parliament discussed at its open session the draft laws, submitted by the Russian President. Commenting on the draft law on the transformation of the Chechen-Ingush Republic integrated in the Russian Federation submitted by the president, which provides for the creation of the Chechen and Ingush republics integrated in the Russian Federation, Anatoliy Anikyev, chairman of the Commission for Nations that fell victim to repressions or were deported, under the Council of Nationalities of the Supreme

Soviet, said: The draft law practically legalizes the processes taking place in the Chechen Republic. He suggested a more accurate wording, as Ruslan Khasbulatov put it: The problem of the Chechen Republic will be resolved after the settlement of the crisis situation there.

Sergey Shakhray, Russian deputy prime minister and state adviser for legal matters, who took part in the session, pointed out: The draft law submitted by the president cannot be approved on the level of the presidium. On behalf of the commission Anikiev supported the suggestion of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Karachayevo-Cherkessia Republic that a public opinion poll on the division problem be held on March 14. He pointed out that in order to create two separate autonomous entities it is necessary to set borders between them. The absence of borders will lead to inter-ethnic confrontation, he added. According to Anikyev, the developments of the past several days show that confrontation in the Karachayevo-Cherkessia Republic is growing.

Parliament To Hold Defense Policy Session

OW0303144992 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1348 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Vice-Chairman of the parliamentary committee for defence and security, Boris Bolshakov, said that Russia needed a defence ministry and armed forces of its own. During his meeting with delegates of the NATO Assembly, Boris Bolshakov said that Russia's defence policy would be discussed at a closed session of the Russian parliament "which is expected to take specific decisions".

Boris Bolshakov also said that the drafting of Russia's defence doctrine is inextricably linked with its foreign policy, whose draft version is being discussed by the parliamentary commissions and committees.

Prior to the closed session, the parliament will discuss arms exports. Boris Bolshakov stressed that the parliament would not discuss whether or not to export arms. What needed to be cleared out is who will buy them and to what extent the parliament will control arms exports, he said.

It was noted at the meeting that the conversion problems were aggravated by restrictions put on technological aid to Russia in individual countries. The participants expressed hope that the NATO Assembly would help solve this problem.

Khasbulatov Accused of Human Rights Violations

LD0303220492 Moscow POSTFACTUM in English 2033 GMT 2 Mar 92

[From the "Politics" section]

[Text] Moscow—Members of the human rights committee of the Russian Supreme Soviet (Parliament) propose forming a commission to investigate human rights violations by chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov.

On March 2, members of the human rights committee of the Russian Parliament Nikolay Arzhannikov, Mikhail Molostvov, Anatoliy Mostovoy and Vladimir Mukusev submitted a petition to the presidium of the Russian Supreme Soviet stating that on February 28 a group of ethnic Chechens applied to the committee with a complaint for having been expelled from Moscow hotels. In doing this, hotel administration cited an oral instruction received directly from Ruslan Khasbulatov.

Nikolay Arzhannikov, deputy chairman of the Human Rights Committee, and Oleg Orlov, a leading expert of a sector of the committee, checked the facts. On March 2, Arzhannikov told PF [POSTFACTUM] that they learned from talks with Russian Interior Minister Viktor Yerin, head of the Moscow Interior Directorate Arkadiy Murashev and hotel directors on February 28-29 that, at approximately 22.00 on February 13 Ruslan Khasbulatov called Yerin over the phone telling him to gather all directors of Moscow hotels for an urgent meeting with the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation. Yerin instructed Arkadiy Murashev to provide assistance in organizing the meeting. Control over the fulfillment of the order to notify hotel directors was placed upon Sergey Zhukov, duty officer at the reception office of the head of the Moscow Interior Directorate. According to the officer, the last report on the fulfillment of the order came in at 5 a.m. On February 14. The meeting of hotel directors with the chairman of the Supreme Soviet took place at 9 a.m. On February 14 and lasted about 10 minutes. The meeting was also attended by Yerin and Murashev.

Nikolay Arzhannikov quoted Arkadiy Murashev saying that Chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet, Ruslan Khasbulatov, issued an oral ruling that no Chechens were allowed to check in at Moscow hotels and those already staying there were moved out. Over the next several days Moscow police officers held a number of inspections at local hotels and detained ethnic Chechens. On February 18 Moscow hotels received a telephone message from Deputy Mayor Yuriy Luzhkov, who asked to cancel all nationality restrictions in boarding at Moscow hotels. According to Arzhannikov, at present hotel directors follow either Khasbulatov's order or Luzhkov's telephone message basing on their personal concept of legality. At the meeting of the Russian Supreme Soviet's Presidium Khasbulatov did not give the floor to Arzhannikov and after the meeting refused to talk to him. Khasbulatov stated: What, are you going to check me too?

In his interview Arzhannikov assessed Khasbulatov's behavior as a distinct exhibit of authoritarian ways. In their statement committee members suggest including the ousting of Chairman of the Supreme Soviet in the agenda of the 6th Russian Congress of People's Deputies in case a special commission confirms all the above mentioned facts. Arzhannikov said in interview to PF that the issue will be discussed at the next meeting of the Supreme Soviet's committee on human rights.

Decision on Sakhalin Fuel Rights Set for 9 Mar

OW0303173192 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1557 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Russia will make a final decision March 9 on the right to own the oil and gas field of the Sakhalin Island, Yevgeniy Penkovsky, a member of the commission of the Russian parliament and a Deputy of the Sakhalin region told "Interfax". According to Penkovsky the parliamentary committee has already submitted its decision which is being kept "strictly secret" to the Presidium.

Previously, in late January the committee of the Russian government had announced the consortium "Three M" the winner of the competition. "Three M" is made up of two American companies, McDermott and Marathon, and the Japanese company Mitsui.

There was a conflict concerning the results of the competition when the head of Sakhalin administration Valentin Fedorov refused to sign the government committee's decision, claiming that it "doesn't satisfy the interests of the inhabitants of the island". Fedorov insists on the overall development of the field, whereas under the government committee's decision "Three M" would develop just over 5% of the oil field which was initially offered in the competition.

Regional Affairs

Moscow Government Bans 17 Mar Rally

OW0303194292 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1843 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Moscow government has ruled by 13 votes against 6 to ban the holding of a rally in Manezh Square on March 17 by those who initiated the street procession along Tverskaya Street that caused public disturbances on February 23. At its Tuesday [3 March] session the Government decided to issue a special statement explaining the motives of the ban.

The ministers will urge superior government bodies to assess in legal terms the slogans with which the rally organizers intended to hold their action. In the view of the Moscow government, leaflets circulated in the Russian capital now are calling for the actual overthrow of the present republican administration, which may be punishable under the law.

Moscow Procurator Gennadiy Ponomarev told the session that he had appointed a group of experts to investigate the circumstances of the February 23 unrest and consider filing lawsuits against persons who offered resistance to the police.

Deputy Mayor Cited

LD0403124792 Moscow TASS in English 1215 GMT 4 Mar 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Galina Sugak]

[Text] Moscow March 4 TASS—Moscow's authorities have decided to ban public rallies in the city during the country's transitional period to a market economy.

Speaking on recent events in the city which involved clashes between police and demonstrators during public rallies on February 23, Moscow Vice-Mayor Yuriy Luzhkov said that "vandalism and the willful disobedience of some demonstrators show that organisers of the rallies failed to control the situation".

The city prosecutor instigated legal proceedings against people accused of damaging city property and violating public order. According to experts, the total damage is estimated at 11,000 roubles. In addition the city lost 105,000 roubles due to public transport detention.

Moscow Government Develops Privatization Plan

OW0303212192 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1907 GMT 3 Mar 92

[From the "Soviet Business Report"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Moscow Regional Committee on Property Management has developed a program to privatize the Moscow region in 1992. The program will require mandatory privatization of 39 stores, 5 wholesale centers, a restaurant in the city of Naro-Fominsk, 4 consumer service enterprises, 47 construction organizations, 41 factories producing construction materials, 62 enterprises in the food and food processing industries, 68 light-industry businesses, 25 local industries, and 28 freight transportation associations.

The Moscow region has a population of 6.7 million, occupies an area of 47,000 square kilometers (excluding Moscow), and is one of Russia's most important agricultural and industrial areas. In 1991 total industrial and agricultural production for the region reached 60 billion rubles ($600 million according to the official market rate offered by the Central Bank of Russia), one third of which comes from light industry. Almost 60% of all the enterprises in the Moscow region are large businesses in the defense industry which employ between 10,000 and 20,000 people each.

FOREIGN COMPANIES WILL BE ALLOWED TO TAKE PART IN PRIVATIZATION ONLY ON A COMPETITIVE BASIS. The project for privatizing the

Moscow region will allow foreign investors to participate in the privatization of stores, automobile factories, small industries and construction associations only under the conditions of commercial investment competitions (investors will compete for rights to invest in a specific enterprise).

Foreign investors wanting to participate in other types of privatization for these enterprises (auctions, price competitions) must receive authorization from the Russian State Committee on the Management of Government Properties (Goskomimushchestvo).

Foreign investors must receive permission from the Russian government in order to participate in the privatization of large industrial enterprises (with collective investment funds valued at over 200 million rubles ($2.22 million) or employing over 10,000 people), insurance companies and firms acting as intermediaries on the securities market. The Russian government also plans to require licensure for foreign investors participating in privatization.

Mandatory licensure requirements will apply to foreign investors participating in the privatization of enterprises in the fuel and energy industry, businesses undergoing economic conversion, and enterprises with production having scientific capacity (businesses spending over 10% of total expenditures on scientific experiments and research and development).

INCENTIVES OFFERED TO FOREIGN INVESTORS. The Moscow regional government is expected to provide incentives to foreign investors participating in the privatization of:

—unprofitable enterprises

—unfinished construction sites

—businesses with decreased production due to insufficient raw materials and equipment

—businesses engaged in preliminary processing of agricultural production and enterprises in the food industry

—enterprises producing construction materials.

In order to encourage the participation of foreign investors in the privatization of these enterprises, the government will allow foreign investors to:

—purchase controlling stock or all the stock of an enterprise (excluding stock which will be offered to employees)

—acquire on contractual terms rights to manage stock packages belonging to foundations.

Foreign investors must have the approval of the Committee on Foreign Investment of the Ministry of Economics and Finance of the Russian Federation in order to acquire companies or shares of a single enterprise valued at over $10 million, as well as a controlling stock in such enterprises.

Muscovites View Government Aid as Inadequate

PM0403141692 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Mar 92 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by Nugzar Betaneli, director of the Institute of Sociology of Parliamentarianism, on results of 27 February public opinion poll, under the "Prediction" rubric: "Aid for the Poorly Off Is Inadequate"]

[Text] The independent Institute of Sociology of Parliamentarianism carried out on 27 February its latest weekly poll of Muscovites for the Television News Agency (ITA) "Itogi" program. A comparative analysis of the nine telephone polls (based on a sample of 1,000 respondents) carried out by the institute in January and February showed:

A week ago we wrote that despite the February debates, rallies, and strikes, tolerance is apparently the most characteristic feature of social psychology, and the social explosion that many politicians and experts predict in the near future is seemingly not in fact a threat to society. The past seven days cause us to add a questionmark to that assertion. It is not known how the population will react to the Russian Government "Memorandum" on economic policy, which assumes, in particular, a further 50-75 percent overall increase in prices.

On the day of the poll (27 February) the population of Moscow were not yet familiar with the "Memorandum," and all three indicators which we have been measuring constantly over the last two months indicated a continuation of the positive trends of February. In the last seven days of February the number of those who are satisfied with life again increased slightly, and the number of those who are dissatisfied fell.

Are you satisfied with your life at present?

Percentage of those polled			
	30 Jan	20 Feb	27 Feb
Yes	13	25	27
No	81	68	65
Don't know	6	7	8

However, this optimistic picture is altered drastically by an analysis of the mood of various social demographic groups. Some 75 percent of pensioners are not satisfied with their lives, 73 percent of the engineering and technical intelligentsia, 71 percent of nonworking invalids, and 68 percent of women.

A section of society is still suffering as a result of price liberalization and is unable to adapt to it. But it is worth noting that in January only 7 percent of people replied "it is not as bad as it seemed" and "it suits me," while by the end of February this was the view of one in 10 of those polled. It is quite possible that we are observing the outlines of a social stratification of people according to income.

The price liberalization is tolerated least well by the age groups "50-59"—50 percent; and "60 plus"—48 percent; among workers the figure is 37 percent, among pensioners—50 percent, and among nonworking invalids—54 percent.

The Russian Government is constantly declaring its commitment to helping the poorly off population, but 69 percent of those polled consider that aid to be inadequate. This is how Muscovites answered a question about this aid.
Adequate at this stage—6%
Inadequate, but enables them to make ends meet—27%
Completely inadequate—42%
I know nothing about this aid—14%
I know about it, but cannot decide—11%

Aid to the poorly off population has a wider sociopsychological influence on society than might appear at first glance. Computer modeling carried out by the institute showed that if the government could provide more tangible aid to pensioners, invalids, and single mothers, the level of satisfaction with life in society would increase from 27 to 44 percent, even given the same prices and economic problems.

In the past week people's faith in the success of B. Yeltsin's economic policy has declined slightly—from 48 to 45 percent. The number of "don't knows" has increased (18 percent). Two-thirds of Muscovites (76 percent) consider the situation in Russia unstable and changeable. And only 8 percent of those polled are confident that the government is in control of the economic situation.

This is how Muscovites answered the question: Do you feel able predict how events will develop in Russia in the coming year?
Yes, confidently—11%
Yes, but not entirely confidently—15%
No, the situation is unpredictable—43%
Don't know—31%

An analysis of the responses of the 26 percent of Muscovites who ventured to give their prediction shows that 46 percent of them have predominantly negative expectations, 38 percent believe the situation will improve, and 16 percent think everything will stay at the same level.

A certain stabilization of the situation in February was reflected positively in the collective rating of Russia's politicians: Whereas on 13 February 43 percent of those polled trusted no politicians, by 27 February the number of skeptics had fallen to 34 percent. Among politicians inspiring the greatest trust, 33 names were mentioned. In the lead are: B. Yeltsin—27 percent of all those polled; A. Rutskoy—7.4 percent; G. Popov—4 percent; Ye. Gaydar—2.4 percent; R. Khasbulatov—2.2 percent; A. Sobchak—2 percent; Shakhray—1.3 percent.

Compared with the beginning of the month, B. Yeltsin's personal popularity has not changed, on the surface. A large number of people (42 percent) have an unequivocally positive view of the Russian president. There are fewer openly negative assessments (11 percent, as against the previous 13). At the same time, nearly one in four of those polled shows "some degree of caution" in his view of the president. And another disturbing change—the number of "active supporters" of B. Yeltsin has fallen from 7 to 4 percent.

St. Petersburg Launches Privatization Program

LD0303192892 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1209 GMT 3 Mar 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Irina Zolotareva]

[Text] St. Petersburg, 3 Mar (TASS)—More than 2,000 St. Petersburg enterprises and organizations will be privatized this year. This rate of implementation of one of the key economic reforms has been proposed by the Mayoralty Committee for Administration of Urban Property, whose experts devised the local privatization program.

Committee Chairman Sergey Belyayev says the issue is now only about minor privatization. Minor not in volume, but in the list of program facilities. These include trade and catering enterprises, transportation and building organizations. By granting these sectors wide opportunities for development and liberating the local budget from the burden of supporting grants, it will be possible to embark on "major", complex privatization as well, which according to forecasts, taking into account the specific features of St. Petersburg's industry, will take more than a decade.

The overall sum of revenue from privatization in 1992 for St. Petersburg should amount to 3.5 billion rubles.

St. Petersburg City, Oblast in Land Dispute

PM0403153392 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 26 Feb 92 First Edition p 2

[ITAR-TASS report: "In the Garden, in the Truck Garden"]

[Text] The stormy disputes between the authorities of St. Petersburg and the oblast over the allocation of land for gardens and truck gardens—disputes that flared up with new force at the time of Ruslan Khasbulatov's recent visit to the city on the Neva—are still continuing. But the head of the Russian parliament assigned just 10 days to resolve this problem.

The document drawn up by the soviets' working groups proposes that city dwellers will retain the plots of land allocated for truck gardens last year. A special St. Petersburg land fund is being set up with an area of at least 40,000 hectares.

Dudayev Cites Caucasus Unification Conditions

LD0303232792 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 2230 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Text] Interviewed by a RIA correspondent, Dzhakhar Dudayev has spoken in favor of setting up a Caucasian confederation and in favor of cooperation with Russia. He named four directions for the unification of the Caucasus: the withdrawal of all CIS troops from the Caucasian republics; a temporary political treaty between all parties and movements and their subordination to a single program; the unification of all religions and beliefs; and the creation of a single Caucasian armed forces for localizing conflicts.

Despite a determination to implement these provisions, Dudayev regards cooperation with Russia as a condition for the existence of a future confederation of Caucasian states. The hour of decision has come for the peoples of the Caucasus, the president of the Chechen Republic said. Either we regain the freedom which was lost centuries ago, or we will have to forget this dream for centuries to come, the RIA agency reports.

Chechen Military Groups Based on Clans

LD0403002492 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1700 GMT 3 Mar 92

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] SEVERNYY KAVKAZ [NORTHERN CAUCASUS] newspaper published information on military groupings now active in the Chechen Republic. These groups are mainly relatively small formations of 50 to 200 people; however, they are numerous and are formed in a typically Caucasian way—military formations are either based on clans or are directed at specific politicians. There are groupings of the clan of the former chairman of the Supreme Soviet, of the clan of the interior minister, and even of the general procurator.

Kuzbass, Moscow Establish Direct Economic Ties

LD0303184592 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0700 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Text] The Kuzbass and Moscow have set up direct economic ties. A treaty signed between the government of the Russian capital and the Kuzbass administration is evidence of this. Coal for heating electric plants will be supplied to Moscow as well as metals and chemical industry products. In return, the Siberian residents will get the equipment they need, automobiles, and consumer goods. The Kuzbass is to open its permanent mission in Moscow.

Kuzbass Gold Association To Act Independently

LD0303231992 Moscow POSTFACTUM in English 2033 GMT 2 Mar 92

[From the "Business News" section]

[Text] Kemerovo—The Kuzbass-Zoloto (Kuzbass Gold) Association split from the Novisibirsk Zapsibzoloto (West Siberian Gold) Corporation.

At the March 2 press-conference Mikhail Kislyuk, head of the Kemerovo regional administration, commented on the results of the February 29 founders' meeting of the Kuzbass-Zoloto Association. Kislyuk stated that within one week the appropriate statutory documents of the association will be signed and from now on the association will independently produce and sell gold. According to Kislyuk, for a start the statutory fund will be small—R50 mln [million]. The first objective set by Kemerovo administration head was to produce 100 kg of gold in 1992.

The Kuzbass-Zoloto Association unites representatives of Kemerovo region gold producing enteprises.

Vorkuta Miners Threaten To Start Patrols

LD0303175592 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 3 Mar 92

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Leaders of the Vorkuta mining movement have sent an appeal to Russian President Yeltsin demanding that they be permitted to carry firearms. This was provoked by the recent attack in Moscow on the leader of the mining movement in Vorkuta. If this demand is not met by 1 April the miners reserve the right to set up armed workers' voluntary patrols.

Rostov Communists Demand Government Resignation

LD0303221192 Moscow POSTFACTUM in English 2033 GMT 2 Mar 92

[From the "Politics" Section]

[Text] Rostov-on-Don—Leader of the Rostov section of the Russian Communist Worker Party (RCWP): Rostov communists are negotiating with Democrats and Monarchists on joint actions to bring down the Government of the Russian Federation.

Chairman of the Rostov Regional RCWP section Fyodor Lobov, speaking to PF [POSTFACTUM] on March 2, refused to name the democratic factions involved in the negotiations, citing an uncertain character of the situation. According to Lobov, a rally is planned for March 15 in Rostov-on-Don to voice support for an All-Russian Popular Assembly, demand a resignation of the Russian Government and a formation of a national unity cabinet. The rally will supposedly be attended by the working Rostov movement, comprising communist and patriotic organizations, and the Don territorial assembly uniting Cossacks and Monarchists.

Dagestan Endorses Law on Right To Bear Arms

LD0303221992 Moscow POSTFACTUM in English 2033 GMT 2 Mar 92

[From the "Politics" section]

[Text] Makhachkala— On February 29 Dagestan Supreme Soviet approved in the first reading the law on the right to purchase, keep and bear arms.

Adoption of the law was initiated by Vladimir Moshkov, director of the Dagestan Federal Security Agency. According to the draft law, all residents of the republic will be permitted to bear arms after the age of 18, with the exception of mentally impaired and confined. The final adoption of the law is expected at the next session of the parliament after discussion with experts and public.

Gadzhiy Makhachev, leader of the Imam Shamil Public Front, suggested an amendment envisaging giving out one handgun to each resident of the republic. He justified his proposal with the recent expansion of terrorist activities in Dagestan. Over the last several months terrorist acts were organized against high-positioned officials. In one of these acts Magomed Suleymanov, leader of the Democratic Dagestan Movement, was murdered.

Bread Coupon Experiment in Kemerovo Abolished

PM0303154992 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Mar 92 First Edition p 1

[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA-ITAR-TASS column report: "Bread Coupons Abolished in Kemerovo"]

[Text] Bread coupons were abolished 1 March in Kemerovo. A spokesman for the city administration informed the population that the experiment of January-February had not justified itself. Siberians have been waiting in line for hours, and what is most surprising is that in spite of quotas having been established for the issue of bread, the demand for it rose by several dozen tonnes a day.

With the abolition of coupons bread costing a ruble and several kopecks per loaf is also to disappear from the shelves. On the other hand, it will not be too expensive. The city authorities promise an average price for a small loaf of around four-five rubles; after all, through subsidies from the budget, prices for grain being procured will be lowered.

International Affairs

Price Rise Forces Closure of Gas Pipeline

LD0303193992 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 3 Mar 92

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] In response to Turkmenia's decision to increase prices for natural gas by 50 times, Ukraine has closed the section of the pipeline on its territory through which Turkmenian gas is exported. Agreement previously was reached with Ukraine for gas supplies at 800 rubles per 1,000 cubic meters.

Fokin Appeals to Turkmenistan

LD0303170892 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1512 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Address by Ukrainian Prime Minister Vitold Fokin; place and date not given—live or recorded]

[Text] Esteemed viewers: Extreme circumstances have forced me to request television time.

We were invited to Ashkhabad where we were warmly and cordially received and it was proposed that from 1 March we pay 870 rubles for gas, which back in December 1991 cost 34 rubles per 1,000 cubic meters. Well, the arguments were quite sharp though professional and, as they say, we agreed on 800 rubles. In other words, 25 times what we paid previously.

It appears that even this was not enough. It turns out that this already absurd, fantastically absurd price does not include costs relating to transporting the gas, when it has always been believed that one cannot buy a bicycle and its saddle separately. We have always paid for gas that arrived at the border with Ukraine—that is, at Ukraine's border with Russia, in this case. In other words, we now have to pay almost 1,600 rubles per 1,000 cubic meters of gas. It is not hard to calculate that this is 50 times what we paid in December 1991. Of course this is incomprehensible but it is, unfortunately, a fact. it would be futile to seek some kind of logic in this, or any kind of arguments, calculations, or rationale.

No, the economic area we inhabit is called the CIS—that is, the Commonwealth of Independent States. Everyone knows that Ukraine had a significant role in its creation. But let me ask you: What sort of a Commonwealth it must be—and I apologize for twisting the phrase around—when even a civilized community of enemies [sovrazhestvo], concerned about public opinion, cannot, with impunity, allow itself to use its monopoly position to the detriment of other states. I am convinced that such actions inflict a blow not only on the Ukrainian economy, they also inflict a blow on all the other states of the Commonwealth.

Judge for yourselves: things have developed in such a way that the most powerful areas of Ukraine have a large proportion of Turkmen gas in their fuel supplies. For example the Donetsk-Zaporozhiye area has 42 percent, Lugansk 29 percent, Dnepropetrovsk 60 percent. So it is not difficult to imagine the production of metal and pipes coming to a standstill, the mining of iron and manganese ore ceasing or falling sharply in volume, the production of Lugansk diesel locomotives stopping, and so on. That is, it is not possible for something like this to happen without all of the other republics, independent states, subjects of the former Soviet Union, being affected by this fall in production as a result.

Let me say this: Will the people of Turkmenistan themselves benefit from this? I do not think so. After all, the volume of gas extracted will have to be cut by at least a third and this is a main source of revenue for the republican budget. That is not all, however. It is known that Ukraine has an advantageous geographical position. Transcontinental gas pipelines transporting to Europe over 100 billion cubic meters of gas per year cross its territory, including, incidentally, 11 billion cubic meters of Turkmen gas, and this is all but the main source of hard currency revenue coming into this republic. So, should Ukraine, as a reciprocal action, close the valve? Should Ukraine now close these main gas pipelines? What then? At best we could demand appropriate payment in hard currency, in line with all international norms. But who is capable of this today?

I think that it is still not too late to show restraint, to revoke this precipitate decision, and to accept the proposal we are constantly making today. A trilateral agreement or rather trilateral talks should be held between Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and the gas concerns of Russia responsible for transporting the gas across the whole territory. The imposed prices would be simply ruinous for our economy.

I should like to use this opportunity to make an appeal on television because it is more difficult to do this by telephone. I should like to appeal to Turkmen President Comrade Niyazov with this request: Esteemed Saparmurad Atayevich, will you agree that Ukraine did not give you the slightest reason for inflicting an action upon it aimed at destruction of its economy? I appeal to you to show restraint and wisdom and find an option acceptable for both sides. You have to agree that it is simply impossible to imagine a Commonwealth in which we are living now without such reasonable, balanced decisions. Thank you.

Russian Intentions Toward Fleet Criticized

OW0203213892 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1612 GMT 2 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Ukrainian National Assembly, a radical nationalist organization, has stated that Ukraine is likely to reconsider its plans to go nuclear-free in response to Russia's intention to extend its power over the Black Sea fleet.

The Assembly says that "Russia's agressive policy seeking to appropriate the Black Sea fleet and the Crimea upsets political and military stability in the world and is another argument in favour of the Ukrainian government changing its nuclear policy".

Latvia's Share of USSR Foreign Debt Pledged

LD0203220392 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1830 GMT 2 Mar 92

[From the Press Review]

[Excerpt] Moscow, 2 March (ITAR-TASS)—[passage omitted] Ukraine is prepared to take upon itself payment of the Latvian part of the foreign debt of the former USSR, Maris Gailis, Latvia's Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, told journalists. This news is reported from Riga by IZVESTIYA. This means approximately 1.14 per cent of the overall debt which rests with Latvia. Latvia's portion of gold and diamonds will then go to Ukraine, which will also claim that part of the money owed to the Soviet Union by the developing countries which is intended for the Latvian side. [passage omitted]

Morozov on Agreements With Hungarian Military

LD0403000892 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1905 GMT 3 Mar 92

[by ITAR-TASS correspondent Sergey Zhirnikhin]

[Text] Budapest, 3 March (TASS)—Military missions of Ukraine and Hungary will be opening in the near future in Budapest and Kiev. In other words, military-diplomatic relations will also be established between the two countries. This was stated today at a news conference on the results of the official visit to Hungary of Ukraine Defense Minister Colonel General Konstantin Morozov.

Because Hungarian Defense Minister Lajos Fur was ill, Morozov held talks with Erno Raffay, state secretary for Hungary's Ministry of Defense. As a result, an agreement was signed on ties in the military sphere between the ministries of defense and the national armies of the two countries. This document envisages military cooperation "taking into account common interests."

In the words of K. Morozov, in the initial stage this cooperation will consist of information exchange and the holding of joint consultations and conferences on military matters. The document reflects "the mutual trust of the sides on questions of defense." K. Morozov also stated that Ukraine's defense doctrine, including its position with regard to nuclear weapons, is meeting ever greater support from the world community. The treaty signed today signifies the strengthening of trust between two neighboring states, Hungary and Ukraine, he stressed.

In his turn, E. Raffay noted that both in the near future and in the long term Hungary and Ukraine "will closely cooperate in the sphere of the military-industrial complex."

Touching on the same subject, K. Morozov said that today the defense complex of enterprises situated in Ukraine has come up against very serious problems in insuring that they are employed and fully occupied with orders. Ukraine envisages broad development of cooperation with foreign states, and first and foremost with neighboring ones, on mutual exchange of military orders, as a major way of getting out of the situation that has taken shape. A second direction in solving this problem is broad conversion of military production, Ukraine's defense minister noted.

Answering a question from Hungarian journalists about why Ukraine needs such a big army, K. Morozov replied:

"The figure of 400,000 men, cited earlier, indeed exceeds the country's requirement for a reliable defense. Therefore the numbers of Ukraine's national army will be less than that. However, this problem is complicated by the fact that it is very difficult to provide housing for military personnel discharged into the reserve and to offer them work according to civilian specialities."

German Resettlement Matter of 'Justice'

PM0303163192 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Mar 92 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by Sergey Tsikora: "Germans' Return to Ukraine a Question of Justice, Not Politics"]

[Text] Kiev—It appears that Ukraine is overcoming the difficulties that Russia encountered when tackling the problem of deported Germans.

Doctor Hans-Jochen Vogel, vice president of the Socialist International and well-known FRG politician, after visiting Kiev and meeting the republic leadership, said that Ukraine is a stabilizing factor in CIS poliical life.

The prominent German politician's stay in Ukraine coincided with several organizational measures that are being implemented in the republic to resolve the "German question." You could say that the chief one was President L. Kravchuk's meeting with the leaders of several southern oblasts, where it is intended to resurrect the German settlements. I would remind you that there were more than 400,000 citizens of German nationality living in Ukraine before the war.

"The Germans' return to the places where they formerly lived is not a political question as far as we are concerned," L. Kravchuk said. "It is a matter of restoring justice, an essential norm of life in a democratic state.

That is Ukraine's principled approach to the problem of all deported peoples. The republic authorities will give the Germans as much help as possible to return to the places where they used to live."

The statement by the leaders of Kherson, Odessa, Nikolayev, and Zaporozhye Oblasts and Crimea to the effect that a local poll showed that the population looked kindly on the Germans' possible arrival should be seen as an important factor.

The seriousness of Ukraine's intentions is confirmed by a number of facts. This very year Kherson Oblast is taking 250 German families, and by the year 2000 it is prepared to accept 100,000 returnees. Odessa Oblast is preparing for the arrival of 40,000 people, Nikolayev Oblast for 20,000, and Crimea already has applications from 3,000 families...

The Ukrainian president has instructed the republic Cabinet of Ministers to accelerate the preparation of a special government resolution on the return of the Germans. The question will be tackled comprehensively. The republic will create a resettlement program on the basis of its own efforts, L. Kravchuk stressed, although we make no secret of the fact that we want working Germans to come to Ukraine, the president said.

"Given the republic leadership's stance and the attitude of the local populace, many Germans will want to return to Ukraine," Genrikh Grout, chairman of the former USSR Interstate Council of Germans, said.

Representatives of the German "Rebirth" [Wiedergeburt] Society announced that a special fund has already been established for the migrants. The intention is to open a specialized bank, with its own branches, in the very near future. There is support for the idea of obtaining the funds required for the mass migration from the profits of German-Ukrainian joint ventures, which the government will encourage to open. The Ukrainian president assured the representatives of the German "Rebirth" society that ethnic areas will be established in places densely populated by Germans.

National Affairs

Reportage on Rukh Decisions, Internal Divisions

Wants Crimean Parliament Disbanded

LD0303225192 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 2100 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Video report from Kiev by correspondent Vladimir Lyaskalo—from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The congress of the Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka [Rukh] has ended in the Ukrainian capital.

[Lyaskalo] Thus, the Rukh grand assembly has not permitted its leaders to split up this popular movement. Rukh remains a mass sociopolitical organization. But, henceforth, it will be headed by three chairmen: Drach, Gorin, and Chornovil. A loyal attitude to President Kravchuk, nevertheless, does not prevent Rukh from opposing him on many important issues. For instance, Rukh's stance on the CIS and on the matter of Crimea is far more radical. Here is what the main resolution of the congress says:

Ukraine's joining the CIS was dictated by the need to break up the empire of the former USSR. But the course of events has shown that this has not removed the threat to Ukraine's sovereignty, and Rukh will try to get Ukraine to leave the Commonwealth, in which compliance with the interests of independent Ukraine is not fully guaranteed.

The resolution on Crimea notes that the Supreme Soviet of Crimea has exceeded its powers, and Rukh demands that it be disbanded and that presidential rule be introduced in Crimea in accordance with the law which already has been passed in its first reading in Ukraine's Parliament.

[Announcer] As we can see, Rukh is becoming an increasingly influential force in Ukraine and, moreover, in the Commonwealth. After all, in influencing Ukraine Rukh may, one fine day, also decide the fate of the CIS.

Leaders Hold News Conference

LD0403001192 Kiev Radio Kiev in English 0100 GMT 3 Mar 92

[From the "Ukrainian Diary" program presented by Mykola Kravchuk]

[Text] The third all-Ukrainian assembly of Ukraine's People's Movement, Rukh, ended its work yesterday in Kiev. The largest sociopolitical organization of this country has entered a new stage of its activities. The primary tasks which were set before the Rukh have been achieved: The Communist Party is no longer on the political stage, monopoly of ideology has given way to a political pluralism, the national idea is gaining more and more adherence, and, finally, Ukraine has become independent. The contribution of Rukh in these gains is big but the tasks facing it now are even greater. In fact, it is a (?base) in the construction of an independent state. This work is much more complicated than the destruction of the totalitarian machine.

At the press conference for journalists, three cochairmen of the People's Movement, Rukh—Ivan Drach, Vycheslav Chornovil, and Mikhaylo Goryn—spoke about the priorities of Rukh in the near future. First, Ivan Drach:

[Drach is heard briefly, fading into English translation] Ukrainian independence was gained due to the position of Russia. In other words, the Democratic Russia was a helping hand. Independence became possible due to the fact that the Ukrainian communists voted in its favor, which in fact was a paradox, but they had to do that way. [sentence as heard] So we could not but use this situation. The task facing the Rukh now is a support of the statehood, filling it with a real content. Federally, all this should go alongside with democratization of the society, but if we do not use this chance to build an independent Ukraine, this would mean that we do not understand the current situation, said Ivan Drach.

The goals of Rukh are building the Ukrainian state and promoting democracy. Its methods are non-violent and constitutional. This is strictly stated in the program of the People's Movement. How to involve people in this work? Answering this question is Cochairman of Rukh Vyacheslav Chornovil.

[Chornovil is heard briefly, fading into English translation] In fact, the thing that we proclaimed Rukh as a massive public political organization of an open type is working for us. We do not introduce all those structures which were typical for the former Communist Party. However, already now a trend has been traced that certain members of Rukh would like to have more centralization and discipline so that all the decisions of the central bodies be obligatory for fulfillment by lower organizations. I call this a thirst for totalitarism [as heard]. But we in the central bodies have limited our interference in the work of the lower organizations, said Vyacheslav Chornovil.

During the past conference the third cochairman of the People's Movement, Rukh, Mikhaylo Goryn, said that in his opinion the parliamentary methods helped to perform in Ukraine the most velvet revolution of all which took place after the breakdown of the USSR. It is a pleasant [as heard] to hear such a comparison. But let's wait and see, because Rukh has a lot of work ahead.

Split Avoided

PM0303150692 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Mar 92 Morning Edition p 2

[Sergey Tsikora report: "Rukh Has Not Split, But Now It Has Three Chairmen"]

[Text] Kiev—The congress of Ukraine's biggest social organization—Rukh [Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka]—has ended.

Internal complexities and the possibility of a split determined the congress organizers' attitude to journalists—no one invited the press and the correspondents had to worry about their own accreditation.

Three days of debates on Rukh's place in the republic's present-day political life showed that the majority of its members support Vyacheslav Chornovil's idea of constructive opposition by this organization to the authorities. In other words, Rukh agrees to support the president, parliament, and the local soviets only as long as their efforts and views of current events and the future coincide.

In order to avoid a split with those Rukh organizations that think that unconditional support for the president's actions is necessary at present, it was decided to elect three cochairmen of the movement at once. Quotas for the formation of Rukh's highest organ were set thus: V. Chornovil was granted the opportunity to delegate two-thirds of the participants to it, and I. Drach and M. Goryn one-third. This is in accordance with the present distribution of political forces within the organization.

"I knew the congress would be dramatic," writer Vladimir Yavorivskiy, a parliamentary deputy and congress deputy, said. "Three years ago no one imagined we would achieve our main aim—Ukraine's independence—so soon. Within the ranks of Rukh, a powerful stratum has developed, of people whom I call new professional revolutionaries. They are prepared to destroy anything and everything, but they are not at all prepared to get down to constructive work. They came to the congress in a mood to continue destroying the foundations of the communist system. But all at once an entirely different political idea was put forward: unity and immediate unification of all progressive forces for practical work to build independent Ukraine. What was needed was not heroes, but ordinary citizens who know how to do their job in their place."

The compromise helped to avert a split. Rukh will work for the good of independent Ukraine. As for the "three-headed leadership," the congress welcomed V. Yavorivskiy's proposal: If serious disagreements arise between them, all three should resign.

The congress adopted program documents clarifying Rukh's strategy and tactics at the present stage of building independent Ukraine.

'Struggle' Seen in Compromise

MK0303151592 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 3 Mar 92 pp 1, 3

[Vitaliy Portnikov report: "Chornovil Becomes Rukh Chairman, But Not the Only One. Delegates Forced To Elect Three Leaders"]

[Text] The struggle of ideas at the Third All-Ukrainian Congress of People's Rukh could not help but develop into a struggle of ambition: Ultimately delegates not only had to approve changes to the movement's program and statutes, but also elect a new Rukh chairman. The poet Ivan Drach, who was elected to this post at the two previous congresses, had to give up his post, but to whom? The Rukh intelligentsia—the founders of the movement from literary and scientific circles and deputies from the People's Rada faction—considered most acceptable the candidacy of Mikhayl Goryn, chairman of the Rukh Political Council, former political prisoner, and one of the leaders of the Ukrainian Republican Party. Incidentally in the past it was the possibility of Goryn, who seemed overly radical, winning victory in the election to the post of chairman that made Ivan Drach agree to be elected for a second term, but today Goryn, who supports in general terms the concept of Rukh as the main force in state development and a support for presidential power, seemed the best candidate. President Leonid Kravchuk tried to back this concept, acknowledging at the congress Rukh's role in initiating the idea of Ukraine's revival and stating his readiness to cooperate with it. But the day before the congress it became obvious that Vyacheslav Chornovil, chairman of the Lvov Soviet, who lost the presidential election to Kravchuk, wants to head Rukh and turn it into an opposition to the authorities. If Chornovil won weighty support at the congress, his opponents from the Rukh leadership intended to put Ivan Drach's candidacy to delegates again. However—like Chornovil himself—they hardly foresaw such a triumph. Following Chornovil's speech on the second day of the congress delegates gave him an ovation and most speakers demanded that the popular politician be elected Rukh chairman. The audience kept on chanting: "Chornovil! Chornovil!" Deputies tried to evict Ukrainian People's Deputy Larisa Skorik, who accused Chornovil of wanting to use the movement to secure power, from the rostrum, but they welcomed Deputies Sergey Golovatyy and Les Tanyuk, who sharply criticized and even insulted the Rukh leadership.

The presidium made up its mind. On behalf of "members of Rukh from the moment it was set up" Ivan Drach read out a statement—the precise people who signed and supported it are still not known—urging delegates who support this document to walk out of the congress, acknowledging the authority of Drach and the Rukh leadership, and reregister members, dividing up supporters of different concepts. It was proposed that the majority set up two parallel organizations. The enraged Chornovil—he had the majority of delegates' votes, but his Rukh would have been deprived of its intellectual potential and parliamentary possibilities—rushed up to the poet Dmitriy Pavlychko, one of the founders of Rukh and chairman of the parliamentary Foreign Affairs Commission, who is considered one of Kravchuk's close advisers, with the words: "Dmitriy, you are an enemy of the Ukrainian people!" Later Chornovil named the statement's authors as Bogdan Ternopolskiy, Kravchuk's consultant and a Rukh activist, and Larisa Skorik. However, a few minutes later the Lvov Soviet chairman called for a quest for a compromise. The talks lasted two hours, after which the congress was familiarized with a statement by the contracting parties hastily written by that same Pavlychko. It described Rukh as an opposition organization giving electoral support to those of the president's positions that do not contravene its platform. It was suggested that three Rukh chairmen be elected at once—Vyacheslav Chornovil, Ivan Drach, and Mikhail Goryn. The congress agreed to that almost unanimously. The organization's leadership—the Central Provid—was formed in line with the following ratio: two-thirds from Chornovil and one-third from Goryn and Drach, although this alignment of forces is fairly arbitrary and reflects only the correlation of delegates' votes, hardly the sympathies of the Provid members. The People's Rukh Congress then said that it would fight for Ukraine to secede from the CIS and demanded the resignation of Vitold Fokin's cabinet, the dissolution of the Crimean Supreme Soviet, the introduction of presidential rule there, and the participation of the Crimean Tatar people's Medzhlis in resolving the Crimean Tatars' problems.

The Rukh chairmen's first news conference confirmed that the accord between us is a compromise born of despair, and the real struggle still lies ahead. Chornovil's supporters hope that their energetic leader will be the main protagonist in the triumvirate; experts watching the Rukh chairman's work in the Lvov Soviet (Chornovil now intends to quit this post) describe him as a capable populist tribune who cannot cope with everyday organizational work. However, Goryn created the Rukh apparatus and Drach has enough prestige within it, not to mention his contacts in intellectual circles. What is more, both of Chornovil's adversaries can always rely on their surviving parties within the Rukh structures, while Chornovil himself is known to resolutely support the idea of departyizing Rukh. He has not succeeded in achieving this as yet—only the organization's leaders will be forced to suspend their party membership. But, however events have developed over the last few months, movements rent by clashes between factions can hardly present the president with serious opposition and can hardly become his mainstay. Kravchuk can continue to form his own "party of power" without any particular worries.

Recent appointments to the State Duma indicate that this party will most likely consist of moderate left-centrists and that it will also have supporters within the Rukh leadership.

Parliament Considers Crimean Events, Referendum

LD0303191492 Moscow Programma Radio Odin Network in Russian 1600 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Text] The Ukrainian Supreme Soviet resumed work today after a recess. Our correspondent Vladimir Sokolov reports from Kiev.

[Sokolov] The first session began with a deputy's question relating to all the alarming recent events in Crimea. A large group of what are called the national riflemen went to Sevastopol in Crimea from western Ukraine, led by the notorious people's deputy Khmara, allegedly to honor the memory of those who fell for the freedom of Ukraine. All they did was to disrupt traffic and aggravate the confrontation with the local population.

The result has been a dramatic increase in the number of Crimean residents signing a demand for a referendum to be held on the future fate of Crimea, possibly outside Ukraine. The deputy's question suggests handing the case of this foolish provocation over to the procuracy.

The no less urgent issue, not on the agenda, of the continuing strike by Krivoy Rog miners was then raised. It was decided to send a deputies' commission [word indistinct] to the Krivoy Rog town soviet and the Dnestr Oblast soviet of people's deputies to deal with the conflict problems that have arisen there.

In an item also not on the agenda, a group of agrarian deputies demanded that urgent measures to ensure fuel, seeds, spare parts for equipment and herbicides for the forthcoming sowing season, since in many areas of Ukraine this is in danger of collapsing completely. The 48 agrarian deputies left the hall and declared that they will not take part in the work of the Supreme Soviet until the problems they raised have been solved.

The matter of repealing an article in the law on enterprises in the section regulating wages was examined. After a fairly lengthy debate, it was agreed that state regulation of wages and the consumer funds of enterprises in general is essential in the current circumstances. It was therefore proposed that the Cabinet of Ministers should present its ideas on such regulation to the Supreme Soviet. It is essential to combine wages with the final result of labor and, at the same time, with state price regulation.

Odessa To Have Foreign Ministry Mission

LD0303174592 Kiev Radio Kiev in English
0100 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Text] Odessa, a port city on the Black Sea with a population of 1 million, will from now on have the mission of the Ukraine's Foreign Ministry. Such a decision was taken by the ministry's commission, taking into account the presence in Odessa of a few consulate generals of foreign countries, a desire of Odessa residents to create a free economic zone, a great number of businessmen and tourists from abroad. The sphere of the mission's interests will include first and foremost consulate functions as well as information work.

Kravchuk Creates National Space Agency

LD0203172392 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1635 GMT 2 Mar 92

[Text] Kiev, 2 Mar (UKRINFORM-TASS)—Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk issued a decree today on the creation of the National Space Agency of Ukraine (NSAU).

Among its main aims is the elaboration of the foundation of state policy in the sphere of studying and using space; the organization of international and interstate cooperation in that sphere; and the financing of work on studying and using space.

Party Criticizes 'Extremist' Groups

LD0203163492 Kiev Radio Kiev in English
0100 GMT 2 Feb 92

[Text] The Kiev territorial branch of the Party of Democratic Rebirth of Ukraine has adopted a resolution on the activity of extremist groups such—in the opinion of this party—as the Ukrainian National Assembly, the Ukrainian Association of Riflemen, the National Forum, etc.

Judging from the text of the resolution, the Ukrainian law enforcement bodies could also belong to these extremist groups because their relations with the organizations mentioned above stir up, I quote, a serious concern among members of the Party of Democratic Rebirth of Ukraine.

Officers in Far East Request Transfers Home

LD2802135992 Moscow Russian Television Network
in Russian 1100 GMT 28 Feb 92

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] Some 300 Ukrainian officers now serving in the Far East have handed in a report requesting their transfer to the National Army of Ukraine to continue their service. Men from Uzbekistan, Moldova, and other Commonwealth states also intend to return to their native areas. The command of the combined units and of the military district will not stand in the officers' way.

Dnepropetrovsk Chief Resigns Over Miner Strike

LD0103041292 Moscow Mayak Radio Network
in Russian 1500 GMT 29 Feb 92

[Text] The situation in the Ukraine remains unstable, judging from an INTERFAX report. Nikolay Zadoya, chairman of the Dnepropetrovsk Oblast Soviet, has conceded to the demands of the Krivoy Rog striking miners and resigned.

The miners' strike has been going on for two weeks now, and out of approximately 20 pits 10 have stopped producing ore.

The strikers' demands are to bring the pitmens' ages up to the level of miners, which are approximately 18,000 rubles a month.

Today's session of the oblast soviet is due either to accept Nikolay Zadoya's resignation or reject it.

Dnepropetrovsk Regional Soviet Criticized

LD0203164492 Kiev Radio Kiev in English
0100 GMT 2 Feb 92

[Text] A joint sitting of the deputies, members of the Democratic bloc in the Dnepropetrovsk regional soviet of the peoples deputies, and representatives of the striking miners of the Krivoy Rog coal basin took place in Dnepropetrovsk. The miners demand reelection [as heard] of the regional soviet because it has not managed to implement the policy of reforms in the region. It was decided to start collecting signatures of voters for convocation of extraordinary session of the regional soviet which should decide whether it resigns or works in constructive ways.

Trade Agreements Signed With Tyumen Oblast

LD0203115192 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2000 GMT 29 Feb 92

[Text] The visit to Kiev by (Yuriy Shafranik), head of the Tyumen oblast administration, has resulted in a decision to open a Ukrainian mission in Tyumen. According to the ROSINFORM agency, during talks with representatives of the Ukrainian Government, mutually advantageous trade agreements were also reached. It was decided that supplies of goods from both sides for the first quarter of this year will remain at the same level as last year. In addition, in March or April Ukraine will send an additional consignment of food and essential goods. In return, Tyumen agreed to provide social protection for 800 Ukrainians who work in oil fields and construction sites of the Tyumen oil and gas extraction industry.

Conversion of Military Industry Fund Approved

LD0103233292 Kiev Radio Kiev in English 2200 GMT 29 Feb 92

[Text] About 1 million workers and engineers are engaged in the military industry in Ukraine. The task nowadays is to switch them over to the production of consumer goods, however large allocations are required for this purpose. Therefore, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine has approved a resolution on setting up a state fund for the conversion of military industry.

It is being formed from the deductions from the cost of certain types of products, the sales of military hardware and voluntary donations. The money will be used for the restructuring of the military industry and transferring it to the output of goods for civil needs.

Minister of Cabinet of Ministers Appointed

LD0103040892 Kiev Radio Kiev First Program Network in Ukrainian 0600 GMT 28 Feb

[Text] Volodymyr Yuliyovych Pikhota has been appointed minister of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine by decree of the president of Ukraine. The decree comes into effect as of the day of its signing.

Entry Visas Available Upon Arrival in Ukraine

LD2802124892 Moscow TASS in English 0807 GMT 28 Feb 92

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Evgeniy Parijskiy]

[Text] Kiev February 28 TASS—Foreigners arriving in Ukraine can get an entry visa to any of the Ukrainian cities right at the border check point.

The "Intourist-Ukraine" agency was authorised by the republican Foreign Ministry to do the job. Besides issuing visas, the agency offers other services to foreigners, including cultural programmes, interpreters, cars to rent.

Moldova

Further Reportage on Disturbance in Dubossary

Cossacks Defend Involvement

PM0303170992 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Mar 92 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by Eduard Kondratov: "Dubossary: Casualties Were Greater"]

[Text] Chisinau—Prime Minister V. Muravschi has made a statement condemning the provocation by Dubossary separatists, "supported by imperial forces," which resulted in human casualties.

Investigators from Tiraspol and other cities in the Dnestr region have started interrogating the detainees—22 Moldovan Internal Affairs Ministry police and 11 civilians—who were directly involved in the bloody events. The police included Internal Affairs Ministry personnel sent here from other areas of Moldova. After the predawn storming of the Dubossary police department there were casualties among the Don Cossacks—23-year-old Mikhail Zubkov was killed and chief Vyacheslav Meshkov was seriously wounded. They were both from Volgodonsk.

How come Don Cossack subunits suddenly appeared in Dubossary? Field chief V. Rateyev explained that they had come at the request of the local Cossacks, who, like the rest of the multinational population of the Dnestr Region, do not want to be under Romanian rule, which is where they are being dragged. They are all volunteers who have taken home leave or have been given leave of absence from work for the duration. The units are being maintained by the sponsors.

When asked if the Cossacks were aware that their participation in the Dubossary events was nothing but interference in sovereign Moldova's internal affairs, the reply was that the Don Cossacks recognize the independence of the Dnestr Republic and that the Cossacks' help for it is not sanctioned by the Russian Government and is merely an expression of the goodwill of Cossacks who have guarded Russian frontiers from time immemorial.

The paper was already signed to press when a report came in to the effect that the inhabitants of neighboring villages supporting Moldova have started to disarm military units in the village of Kochiery. Shots are being fired...

INTERFAX Reviews Developments

OW0303172992 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1557 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Armed clashes resumed in the village of Kochiery, north of Dubossary, on Tuesday [3 Mar].

According to the press center of the Supreme Soviet of the Dnestr Republic, local Moldovans supported by plain-clothed policemen made an attempt to break into the grounds of a local cantonment where one of the 14th army's units is stationed, with a view to seizing firearms. Dnestr national guards helped rebuff the attack, in the course of which Tiraspol battalion commander Vasily Voronkov was killed and 14 national guards were wounded.

The press center says up to 50 armored vehicles have been amassed on Moldovan territory near Kochiery village on the right bank of the Dnestr.

Tensions have been on the rise in the area after Moldovan policemen clashed in Dubossary with Dnestr national guards on Sunday night. The guards managed to seize the city police headquarters.

According to Moldova's interior ministry, the national guards are preparing to seize the police headquarters also in the city of Bendery. The ministry says people in southern Moldova, where the Gagauz Republic was proclaimed in the fall of 1990, have repeatedly attacked various police units.

Chisinau Citizens Demonstrate

LD0303212392 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Text] In Chisinau, thousands of demonstrators are demanding the distribution of weapons and the resignation of President Mircea Snegur after the events in Dubossary where the National Guards has occupied the police administration.

Snegur himself regards the Dubossary incident as a provocation and denies that the Russian authorities are involved in it.

Militia Gathers Near Kochiery

LD0303222192 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 2100 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Text] According to the latest report from the press center of the Dnestr region, over 500 Moldovan OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] members and well-trained volunteers of the People's Front have gathered in the region of the village of Kochiery in Dubossarskiy Rayon. As the result of battles which continued throughout today, five people were killed and 15 were wounded on the Dnestr side. There are wounded on the Moldovan side as well. The military garrison stationed in Kochiery is now controlled by special purpose police detachments.

On Tuesday [3 March] night, President Snegur arrived in Chisinau from New York.

Snegur: Resolution To Be Peaceful

LD0303234792 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 2100 GMT 3 Mar 92

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Moldovan President Mircea Snegur, who has returned from the UN General Assembly in New York, told journalists that he has been informed of the events in Dubossary and that he is planning to resolve the conflict by peaceful means. In saying this, he added that he intends to appeal, as he said, beyond the republic's borders, in order to put in their place the Cossacks and other mercenaries whose appearance in Pridnestrovye has complicated the situation in Moldova.

When Mircea Snegur made this statement, the central street of Chisinau was cordoned off by indignant demonstrators demanding decisive measures against the Pridnestrovye separatists.

Attacks on CIS Troops Viewed

LD0303231792 Moscow TASS in English 2156 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Text] Moscow March 4 TASS—Because of conflicting sides' actions in the Dnestr region—the Moldovan police and guards of the Dnestr Republic that proclaimed its independence from Moldova—formations of the CIS allied armed forces stationed there face an alternative: either to use arms or remain an object of planned and thoroughly considered provocations.

Sources at the CIS allied armed forces' press center told ITAR-TASS on Tuesday [3 March], a detached motorized rifle civil defence regiment of the CIS 14th Army stationed five kilometers away from Dubossary was attacked on Monday by an up to 80 men strong Moldovan armed formation.

About 15:00, the militants disarmed the duty officer and broke into the barrack, where they seized 70 AKM'74 machine guns, five carabines, four small-bore rifles and about 2,000 cartridges.

According to a report of the Russian Vesti news program, the Moldovan police and OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] unit tried to seize the military unit in the Kochiery settlement. The unit's personnel with the help of guards and Cossacks managed to disperse the attackers into small groups. Three people from the Dnestr region were killed, and 14 wounded in combat. Moldovan losses are unknown.

Vesti also reported police forces and APCs [Armored Personnel Carriers] continue collecting on the right bank of the Dnestr River. Assembly of the territorial-rescue team and volunteers of Tiraspol has been announced over the local radio.

At the same time, the Moldovan Interior Ministry reported armed formations from the Dnestr region are attacking the Dubossary regional police department removed to the Kochiery settlement from Dubossary. [sentence as received]

According to UKRINFORM, free-lance photo-correspondent of the GOLOS UKRAINY parliamentary newspaper Alexandr Glyadelov got a leg wound during his trip to Dubossary, where he came together with correspondent of the Ukrainian youth newspaper UKRAINA MOLODA Dmitry Mosiyenko to collect objective information.

Mosiyenko reported from Dubossary over the telephone today, Moldovan armed formations attacked a CIS military unit on the eve of March 3 near the Kochiery settlement. The unit command decided to evacuate families of the servicemen, however, the bus that carried family members got under fire.

The commander of the Tiraspol home guard unit and a bus passenger were killed in a grenade explosion. Several people were wounded, one is in critical condition. The wounded include Glyadelov, who tried to take out the photos on the bus. He is now staying at Dubossary hospital.

According to the information from Chisinau, a rally demanding the adoption of decisive measures as regards leaders of the non-recognized Dnestr Republic was held today near the residence of Moldovan President Mircea Snegur.

Security Minister Addresses Parliament

AU0403105492 Bucharest Radio Romania Network in Romanian 0900 GMT 4 Mar 92

[Bucharest Radio correspondent Gabriel Ionescu telephone report from Chisinau—live or recorded]

[Text] Esteemed listeners, the proceedings of the legislative forum opened one hour ago at the headquarters of the parliament of the Republic of Moldova. In accordance with the endorsed agenda, Mr. Anatol Plugaru, minister of national security, took the floor and read a report on the events that took place recently on the left bank of the Dnestr River, mainly emphasizing the causes and effects of the events.

Mr. Plugaru said that although the events began at the end of last week, the causes must be searched for. This situation is mainly a result of the fact that weapons were circulating freely and that population could get hold of them. The current situation in Transdnestr was not generated by the Security Ministry, the Interior Ministry, or the Christian Democratic Popular Front. Mr. Plugaru noted that the dams over the Dnestr River were mined by separatists, several tonnes of barbed wire were unloaded, and the dam over the Dnestr was opened so that by filling the reservoir with water the population could be prevented from taking refuge on the left bank of the Dnestr and from calling for additional help. Yesterday an armored car opened fire on people. Government officials were present and took note of the situation.

In connection with the people's frame of mind, the national security minister said that people are frightened and are leaving their houses to take refuge on the right bank of the Prut River. Alarms could be heard all day long yesterday in Dubasari [Dubossary] because a general call to arms and rumors were circulating that Moldovan troops would be prepared to attack inhabitants. Hundreds of weapons were distributed. However, the situation changed after a group of civilians in the village of Cocieri [Kochiery] seized several hundred weapons after it attacked a military unit currently subordinated to the Republic of Moldova.

At this moment, Mr. Plugaru is answering parliamentary questions. Further details will be reported in later bulletins.

Clashes Part of Dnestr 'Coup'

LD0403121992 Moscow TASS in English 1137 GMT 4 Mar 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Valeriy Demidetskiy]

[Text] Kishinev March 4 TASS—The latest clashes in Dubossary are a continuation of the state coup going on in the Pridniestr [Dnestr Republic] region of Moldova, according to the republican Interior Minister Anatol Plugaru. Legal structures of power are being dismantled, human rights violated and banditism flourishing in the region, he told the Moldovan parliament on Wednesday [4 March].

Six militants of the Pridniestr armed units were killed and 25 wounded in Tuesday clashes with Moldovan police in the Kochiery settlement in the outskirts of Dubossary, the press service of the city of Tiraspol reported on Wednesday.

Moldovan police suffered no casulaties, Dmitriy Corletianu, head of a department of the Moldovan Interior Ministry, told TASS, quoting preliminary reports. He said the reports on casulaties from the Pridniestr forces need to be checked.

The Pridniestr region, populated mostly by non-Moldavians, opposes the republican drive to unite with Romania and claims sovereignty.

The Moldovan leadership should not abandon the peaceful means it uses to solve the conflict, but it should not passively observe the ruining of the state, Plugaru said, adding he has information on growing discontent of the people in the Pridniestr region with the actions of separatists. They are indignant that their money is used to maintain armed units of guardsmen and Cossacks who often behave themselves shamefully, the minister added.

Cossacks Arrive in Tiraspol

LD0403122292 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 4 Mar 92

[Report from Tiraspol by Gennadiy Varfolomeyev]

[Text] During these warm days the drivers of the village of Kochiery ought to be starting the spring sowing, but the conflict that has flared up is preventing them from leaving their homes. On 3 March, servicemen with the help of guardsmen and Cossacks of the Dnestr Region managed to defend the territory of their military unit in the village of Kochiery. To prevent further bloodshed and possible casualties among civilians living near the military unit, the command decided that the servicemen should leave the territory of the unit. Now, about 200 policemen and members of the OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] of Moldova have based themselves there. They managed to take 12 servicemen hostage along with their commander Lieutenant Colonel Baturi. The policemen on the territory of the military unit are surrounded by guardsmen and Cossacks of the Dnestr Region. The start of new combat actions is not ruled out.

During yesterday's evacuation of servicemen's families a woman and baby were slightly wounded when a bus was fired on. In the course of 3 March 6 people were killed and 25 injured on the Dnestr Region side. Now the situation in Dubossary remains tense. Bridges and dams across the Dnestr in the region of Dubossary are being controlled from both sides by Moldovan policemen and Dnestr Region guardsmen. Armored vehicles and up to 4,000 members of the Moldovan Police Force are continuing to concentrate on the right bank of the Dnestr. A council of atamans of the Black Sea Cossacks was held in Tiraspol which passed a decision to put under its guard vital installations in the town and inhabited centers of the Dnestr Region. Cossacks are arriving in Tiraspol from the Kuban, Don, and Urals. President of the Dnestr Region Igor Smirnov has appealed to the governments of Ukraine, Belarus, and Russia to mediate in talks and to prevent further bloodshed.

Dnestr Forces Have Grad Launcher

LD0403123292 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1033 GMT 4 Mar 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Valeriy Demidetskiy]

[Text] Kishinev, 4 Mar (ITAR-TASS)—Six soldiers of the Dnestr armed formations were killed and 25 injured during clashes on Tuesday [3 March] with the Moldovan Police in the village of Kochiery on the outskirts of Dubossary. This was reported this morning by the Tiraspol press service.

Dmitriy Corletianu, head of a directorate of the Moldovan Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD], told the ITAR-TASS correspondent that according to initial information, there were no fatalities on the side of the Moldovan Police. In his words, the information on casualties on the

Dnestr side needs to be verified again. The Moldovan Ministry of Internal Affairs reports that the night passed relatively calmly in the village of Kochiery. The armed formations of the Dnestr Region were seen to be moving equipment and sub-units. According to Dmitriy Corletianu, a "Grad" rocket launcher has been noticed in their battle formations.

Snegur Trying To Deal With Problem

OW0403114092 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1053 GMT 4 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] President Mircea Snegur of Moldova has told journalists that the republican leadership is "trying to deal with the Dnestr problem by political means," but may turn for help to international organizations if its own efforts prove ineffective. He described the developments in the Dnestr area as "a provocation aimed at disrupting Moldova's admission to the United Nations and CSCE."

Nikolay Corletianu [name as received], head of the Moldovan interior ministry's press center, has told IF [INTERFAX] that Tuesday [3 March] night was relatively calm in Dubossary. Although sporadic shots were fired, the fighting between Dubossary policemen supported by residents of the village of Kochiery and Dnestr national guards supported by Cossack units had stopped by Tuesday evening.

According to reports confirmed by Tiraspol radio, armed clashes in Dubossary resulted in 2 people killed and 23 wounded on the policemen and villagers's side, and 5 people killed and 18 wounded on the side of national guards and Cossacks.

As IF's [INTERFAX] correspondent has learned from the Dnestr parliament's press center, people from a number of cities and villages on the left bank of the Dnestr asked the 14th Army command to help them rebuff possible incursions by Moldovan militants.

The army has stayed out of the fighting on the left bank, confining its activity to reconnaissance air flights over the area.

The newspaper NEZAVISIMAYA MOLDOVA (Independent Moldova) published by the republic's parliament and government, reports that late on Tuesday evening 2 combat planes with Cossacks aboard took off from Cossack-populated areas in the Russian Federation towards the Dnestr capital Tiraspol. The paper says two Cossack regiments are expected to arrive in the Dnestr area.

Interior Ministry Issues Communique

AU0403123292 Bucharest Radio Romania Network in Romanian 1100 GMT 4 Mar 92

[Text] Here is a dispatch from Chisinau received a few minutes ago from our correspondent, Gabriel Ionescu.

[Begin Ionescu recording] A communique of the Press Bureau of Moldova's Ministry of Interior informs that the night of 3 March was quiet on the left bank of the Dnestr, despite continuous separatist provocations of a clearly destabilizing nature. Last night at 2030 GMT, a team of the police watch department on patrol in the town of Benderi [Bendery] was stopped and disarmed by a group of guardists armed with machine guns. Later, in the same town, another patrol team was stopped and their car confiscated; the car was then taken to the guardists' general staff.

After negotiations between the commissar of the city police department and the leadership of the separatists, the detained policemen were released and their weapons and cars returned to them.

After midnight, four armored cars, one of which was caterpillar-tracked, traveled from Dubasari [Dubosarry] to Cocieri [Kochiery] as a provocation to the inhabitants along this route.

The communique of the Ministry of Interior adds that near Lunga village the separatist troops have set up a whole combat perimeter, including an artillery piece usually used to deal with (?hail storms).

In conclusion, the communique emphasizes that the Ministry of Interior is taking all steps to stabilize the situation.

This morning at 0810 GMT, the Parliament of the Republic of Moldova started its session with two reports on the latest developments on the left bank of the Dnestr River presented by Minister of National Security Anatol Plugaru and Minister of Interior Major General Antoci. Mr. Plugaru said that the bridges across the Dnestr were mined by separatist forces, that tonnes of barbed wire were brought over and unloaded there, and that the dam across the river was opened so that the spilled waters would prevent the inhabitants from evacuating and from calling the troops of the Republic of Moldova for help.

Government officials are constantly keeping tabs on developments on the spot. The minister of national security said we are witnessing a process of the people's awakening and revolt, which, sooner or later, will lead to the overthrow of separatist leader Smirnov. The people are asking for help and weapons and are organizing themselves in defense detachments, Mr. Plugaru said.

From the ongoing parliamentary debates we also learned that the guardists are currently being driven out of Cocieri village by force of arms. A new communique of the Ministry of Interior released a few minutes ago announces the first official figures on victims in Cocieri: three dead and four wounded.

Chisinau Radio Station has received countless calls from the republic's citizens, who call on the authorities to resolve the conflict on the left bank of the Dnestr River. A reporter of the aforementioned radio station is currently in Chisinau's Grand National Assembly Square, where a new rally is in progress, after the one held there last night. I will come back with further details later. Gabriel Ionescu, Chisinau. [end recording]

Kyrgyzstan

Turkish Delegation Arrives for Official Visit

LD0303221792 Moscow TASS in English 1049 GMT 3 Feb 92

[Text] Bishkek March 3 TASS—A Turkish delegation led by Foreign Minister Hikmet Cetin arrived for an official visit to the Kyrgyz capital today in order to expand fledgling political, economic, technical, cultural and other ties between the two republics.

Bangladesh also intends to establish diplomatic and economic relations with Kyrgyzstan. A Bangladesh delegation led by State Minister Abdul Mannan is also in Bishkek.

Last week Kyrgyzstan, which according to President Askar Akayev "would like to be Central Asia's Switzerland" as regards foreign policy, was visited by officials from Sweden. The republic has also signed a protocol to establish diplomatic relations with France. Experts from large Kuwaiti oil companies are discussing helping Kyrgyzstan developing its high-depth deposits, as well as supplying equipment and technologies to process agricultural products.

Cooperation Protocols Signed

TA0303182292 Ankara ANATOLIA in Turkish 1550 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Text] Bishkek (AA)—Remzi Ozkan reports Turkey and Kyrgyzstan signed two protocols today, one on the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries and the other mutually lifting visa requirements the moment Kyrgyzstan begins to use its national passport.

Following talks at the ministerial level, Foreign Minister Hikmet Cetin, National Education Minister Koksal Toptan, and State Minister Serif Ercan were received by Kyrgyzstan President Askar Akayev. During the meeting, the ministers gave Akayev a message from Prime Minister Suleyman Demirel. The message was reportedly about the food and medicine Turkey is to donate to Kyrgyzstan. Accordingly, Turkey will give to Kyrgyzstan 1,000 tons of sugar, 1,000 tons of flour, one ton of medicine, and 50,000 tons of wheat. The message says that these items will be delivered the minute Kyrgyzstan needs them.

Also, it has been learned that negotiations will be held concerning another 450,000 tons of wheat Turkey will export to that country.

After the meeting, President Akayev invited Foreign Minister Cetin to address the parliament, thus making him the first foreigner to address the Kyrgyz parliament.

Cetin was received there with a standing ovation. In a speech, he said that Turkey, which shares a common language, religion, and culture with Kyrgyzstan, will do all it can to help the development of that country's democratic institutions.

Later, speaking at a news conference, Cetin said that it is essential to develop communications between the two countries to develop their bilateral relations. Cetin said: "Our officials are continuing to hold talks in Bishkek to help the communications between Kyrgyzstan and the world, to ensure that Turkish radio and television are received here."

Cetin also said that the problem of transportation must be resolved as soon as possible too.

Kyrgyz Foreign Minister Muratbek Imanaliyev said that the Kyrgyz people are impatient for the start of the two countries' cooperation on the issues discussed during the visit.

After the news conference, the cooperation protocols were signed at a ceremony. The ministers then attended a concert in their honor by the Kyrgyz Philharmonic Orchestra.

'Ottoman Turks' Promised Help

TA0303202192 Ankara TRT Television Network in Turkish 1800 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Protocols on education, culture, and communications were signed today in Bishkek between Turkey and Kyrgyzstan. Under the protocols, Turkey will help Kyrgyzstan reach contemporary levels in the field of communications. Turkey will also open a technical school and a Turkish training center in Bishkek. It will also present Kyrgyzstan with a printing press and a knitting laboratory [as heard]. Turkey will meet all of Kyrgyzstan's needs in its efforts to adopt the Latin alphabet and it will also supply the necessary equipment.

A group of people waving Turkish flags were waiting in the snow for hours in front of the Kyrgyz parliament in order to speak with Foreign Minister Hikmet Cetin. They call themselves Ottoman Turks. Their leader said:

[Begin recording] Some 500,000 Ottoman soldiers were taken by Russia as prisoners of war in three wars: the Caucasus War, the Crimean War, and the Balkan War. We have been separated from Turkey for the past 180 years. We want to return to Turkey now. From about 210,000 of us, some 25,000 to 30,000 want to return. [end recording]

Foreign Minister Cetin gave these people the good news that they will receive assistance in returning to Turkey.

New Defense Chief Notes Ownership of Weapons

PM0203125092 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Feb 92 p 3

[Captain 2d Rank Sh. Khayrullin report from Bishkek under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Major General Dzhanybek Umetaliyev Appointed Chairman of the Kyrgyzstan State Committee for Defense Affairs"]

[Text] The Eighth Session of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan Supreme Soviet has ratified the decree of President Askar Akayev appointing Major General Dzhanybek Umetaliyev chairman of the State Committee for Defense Affairs. The newly appointed chairman is 49. He graduated from the Ussuriysk Higher Military Automobile Command School in 1964.

In 1975 he graduated with distinction from the M.V. Frunze Military Academy. He took part in the elimination of the consequences of the earthquakes in Tashkent in 1966 and the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Station. Prior to his appointment as chairman of the State Committee for Defense Affairs, Major General Umetaliyev was chief of staff of Kyrgyzstan's civil defense.

In a conversation, Major General Umetaliyev stressed that Kyrgyzstan seeks the creation of a collective defense bloc of Commonwealth states. At present, in his opinion, the question of creating the republic's own army is not at issue, although the republic reserves that right. It will all depend on the further development of the surrounding situation.

"President Akayev," the major general went on to say, "is following a course of political neutrality and noninterference in the internal affairs of other states. We would like the CIS to have unified Armed Forces. Pending the conclusion of an appropriate convention by the CIS members, the combat equipment, weapons, and military property located on the republic's territory are exclusively its property. Not one tank or combat vehicle, nor any other weapons, can be taken outside Kyrgyzstan other than by agreement with the State Committee for Defense Affairs. Equally, troop movements or troop exercises cannot be carried out at will, without the sanction of the republic's military department."

Vice President Speaks on Aircraft Transfer

LD0303165592 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 3 Mar 92

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent V. Federov] The news that 14 military aircraft had been moved from the republic to Barnaul on the orders of the command outside Kyrgyzstan broke like a bolt from the blue. Another 40 planes and a number of helicopters were also prepared for the same operation. People do not aspire to their own army here but they do not intend just to stand by and watch a carve-up of army property or the movement of military units. Pilots from a number of Arab and African countries were training with this equipment. It was planned to place things on a commercial basis, to earn foreign currency for the republic.

It seems that the falcons [expression used to describe Soviet air aces] in charge did not show sufficient political far-sightedness and they have cast a shadow, not only on the army, but also on all Russians in Kyrgyzstan and they have made interethnic relations more difficult. Feliks Kulov, the republic's vice president, addressing representatives of the command, said:

[Begin Kulov recording] You are involving—some generals, that is—are involving officers in politics. Because these Russian officers will remain here, how will our population regard them then? All officers are against the transfer of these aircraft. The officers themselves are against it. For this reason I have already put forward—people are now ready—(?I shall now put the military airfields under the control of the internal troops). [end recording]

Freeze on Constitutional Court Law Suggested

OW0303121992 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1049 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In Kyrgyzstan President Askar Akayev has suggested that the parliament refrain from bringing into force the law on the constitutional court it passed on Monday [2 March] till the adoption of a new constitution. Speaking in parliament on Tuesday [3 March] he said that the acting constitution causes permanent clashes with lawyers.

He also asked parliament not to be hasty with adopting the new constitution, but let the latest legislation stand the test of time and make constitutional amendments on the basis of the existing experience.

The president announced that experts from the European branch of the United Nations are ready to help with drafting the new constitution so that it would meet the requirements of international law. In this context he urged parliament to support his proposal to form a provisional constitutional bar under the parliament.

Turkmenistan

Halt of Gas Supplies to Ukraine Viewed

PM0303114592 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Mar 92 Morning Edition p 1

[Reports by Sergey Tsikora from Kiev and Vladimir Kuleshov from Ashkhabad under the general heading: "Turkmenistan Has Cut Off Supply of Gas to Ukraine. Major Republic on Verge of Energy Famine"]

[Excerpts] Kiev—Turkmenistan has stopped the supply of gas to Ukraine. The pipeline shutoff was closed at 0600 on Sunday 1 March. The order to this effect came from the government of Turkmenistan.

The Ukrainian Government has taken a very pained view of such an original spring surprise from a Commonwealth country. Not without reason: An accord in principle to continue gas supplies was reached between the republics in the persons of the Ukrainian prime minister and the Turkmen president just a week ago.

But a few days later, the Turkmen side reconsidered and named a new, still higher price for gas. [passage omitted]

Ashkhabad—This decision was adopted in Ashkhabad in response to the Ukrainian Government's refusal, contrary to the accord reached the previous week, to settle up for gas at the price of 800 rubles [R] for 1,000 cubic meters.

Calculations show that even R800 for 1,000 cubic meters is 10 times less than the actual cost of the gas, a similar volume of which costs $85 on the world market. But in Ashkhabad, at the time of the visit here by Ukrainian Prime Minister V. Fokin, who came to reach an agreement on the price of Turkmen gas and the principles for conducting transactions between Ukraine and Turkmenistan, following a brief debate at the level of heads of government, they did not return to world prices. Although a switch to them, in the opinion of Turkmen specialists, would rule out the price barriers that are being erected today between CIS states. The Turkmen Government went along with the request of Ukraine, whose delegation insisted on drawing up a treaty on reciprocal deliveries at the level of the prices in the last quarter of 1991, for, as the Ukrainian side emphasized in the talks, the republic is not yet at all ready to go over to world prices.

"We at first named V. Fokin a price of R2,500 for 1,000 cubic meters of gas," A. Charyyev, deputy head of the Turkmen Government, said. "He refused point-blank—too expensive. Then we said to him: Pay R875 for 1,000 cubic meters, which is what is already laid down in the republic's budget. Again this price did not suit them..."

I do not know how V. Fokin managed to persuade Turkmen President S. Niyazov one-on-one, but the meeting, which lasted one hour behind closed doors, ended in mutual agreement and in a final price for 1,000 cubic meters of gas—R800...

"Turkmenistan agreed to this compromise at that time, mindful of Ukraine's unreadiness to conduct transactions at world prices," I read the report by the press service of the republic's president. "Despite this, the Ukrainian side in the person of Prime Minister V. Fokin put forward a demand for the price of the gas to include the cost of its transportation—which virtually brings it down to R30..."

It turns out that Ukraine has refused to pay even this R800 for 1,000 cubic meters of gas.

"We are experiencing no shortage of offers from many states, including the CIS, to buy our gas," A. Charyyev said. "We need two years, and we will build a gas pipeline to Turkey by way of Iran—this decision was adopted at a meeting with Turkish Foreign Minister Hikmet Cetin, who has just been to Ashkhabad. So we will close this gap in the very near future not only without detriment but at a great advantage to ourselves..."

Diplomatic Relations Planned With U.S.

LD0303213292 Moscow POSTFACTUM in English 1849 GMT 3 Mar 92

[From the "Politics" section]

[Text] Ashkhabad—According to the sources connected with Turkmenistan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, American mission will open in the second quarter of 1992. George Bush, American president, in his letter to Saparmurat Niyazov, Turkmenistan's president, published by the newspaper TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA on March 3rd, said that he would greet opening of the Turkmenian mission in the USA, whereby diplomatic relations would be established between the two states on a full scale. President Bush expressed his wish that Turkmenistan, as a nuclear-free state, join in to the nuclear arms nonproliferation treaty and agree to fulfill demands of IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency] on peaceful use of atomic energy. The USA is satisfied with Turkmenistan's president's assurances that Turkmenistan will satisfy agreements and obligations signed and adopted by the USSR, as well as with the Turkmenian government's promises to continue a course aimed at achievement of various political parties' activities freedom, human rights' observance, including national minorities' rights, emigration freedom, as well at a quicker movement towards the market economy.

Commenting on Bush's letter, Mukhammedmurat Salamatov, editor of the first Turkmenian independent magazine DAYANCH (SUPPORT), told PF (POSTFACTUM]: by expressing his readiness to establish full-scale relations with Turkmenistan, Bush has shown once more that politics and morals are incompatible. Suffice it to recall the numerous declarations of the American Administration representatives who connected recognition of the former Soviet republics with development of democratic processes in them. No law or economic basis underlies the loud-mouthed promises of the Turkmenian leadership. The current situation in Turkmenistan is an example of the Soviet realities of the eighties, when totalitarianism was the core of the state establishment. However, the USA is in a hurry to widen the sphere of its influence and ready to sacrifice the declared ideals for the sake of profits of the moment.

Azerbaijan

Helicopters Evacuate Part of 366th Regiment

PM0303202392 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Mar 92 p 1

[Report by Captain Second Rank V. Urban, Major S. Prokopenko, and Major P. Karapetyan: "Drama in Nagorno-Karabakh: The 366th Departs, Repulsing Gunmen's Bullets and Lies"]

[Text] So, the 366th Motorized Rifle Regiment has left Stepanakert (Khankendy).

But on the evening of 2 March the editorial office received information from its correspondent that the regiment had been stopped 3 km from the city by pickets of women and children.

The military had entered into talks. Then contact with our correspondent was lost...

On the morning of 3 March our correspondent was told at the CIS Joint Armed Forces Press Center that the withdrawal of the 366th Motorized Rifle Regiment from Stepanakert (Khankendy) to Gyandzha is being carried out in a complex situation which is being fueled by both of the sides involved in the conflict.

The regiment is now concentrated in an alternate area. Its exit routes are still blocked by armed formations and the local population. However, it has been possible to move some servicemen to Gyandzha in helicopters.

On 2 March the concentration area of the 3d Motorized Rifle Battalion was attacked by gunmen. It was pointed out at the press center that paratroopers had arrived there, having been sent to provide combat support and to guard the movement of columns of the 366th Motorized Rifle Regiment. With the paratroopers' help the battalion repulsed the gunmen's attacks, but one paratrooper died during the fighting—Sergeant A. Ruder, drafted in May 1990.

At present the situation in the area of the 3d Motorized Rifle Battalion is being monitored [kontroliruyetsya]. The military camp left behind in Stepanakert (Khankendy) has been taken over by local armed formations and the population.

Certain mass media are continuing to carry fabrications about the participation of servicemen, including of the 366th Motorized Rifle Regiment, in combat operations between the Nagorno-Karabakh "self-defense forces" and Azerbaijani armed formations. This particularly concerns the events of 26-27 February in the Khodzhaly region. Our correspondent was told that the CIS Joint Armed Forces Press Center categorically denies such claims, which are totally groundless. Such disinformation, the press center believes, is of a plainly provocative nature and is aimed at casting aspersions on the military and, as a consequence, drawing them into the ongoing interethnic conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh.

Rocket Attack on Evacuation Helicopter Kills 6

LD0303224792 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2150 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Text] Moscow, 4 Mar (TASS)—An Mi-26 military helicopter belonging to the United Armed Forces of the Commonwealth of Independent States (UAF CIS) was downed on the Azerbaijani-Armenian border on Tuesday [3 March] evening. Six people died as a result. As reported to an ITAR-TASS correspondent by Vagan Shirkhanyan, an adviser to Armenia's president, the helicopter was evacuating Armenian women and children who had been left without a roof over their heads, as well as wounded people from Gyulistan village in Nagorno-Karabakh's Shaumyanovskiy Rayon. Not having gotten as far as Armenia, the Mi-26 initially was attacked by Mi-8 helicopters with military markings. It then was shot down by a ground-launched rocket [raketa].

At the central command post of the UAF CIS General Headquarters, it was confirmed to an ITAR-TASS correspondent that the helicopter was shot down and that six people had died. The remaining 31 people, including five crew members, were rescued. Some of them are in grave condition. All of the victims have been taken to hospitals in Armenia. On the morning of 4 March, a commission will be flying out from Moscow to the area of the catastrophe. It will start an investigation.

National Council Appeals to Foreign Parliaments

NC0403172492 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 0430 GMT 4 Mar 92

["Text" of an appeal by the Azerbaijan National Council to parliaments abroad on 3 March—read by announcer]

[Text] Armenia's open aggression against Azerbaijan has now entered its fifth year. The blood of innocent people is being shed in Azerbaijan. We have always said that [words indistinct] the Nagorno-Karabakh region. In their calumny and ideological plots against the Azerbaijanis, the Armenian propagandists and the forces which support them frequently use this term. They describe the aggressor as the victim. Yes, this is what has gone on in the Karabakh mountains. The tragic incidents in Khodzhaly in Nagorno-Karabakh on 26 and 27 February 1992 have brought back the horrible incidents which took place in medieval times.

Another Azerbaijani residential area has been razed to the ground, the merciless Armenian fascists killing and wounding thousands of Khodzhaly residents. The refugees who sought shelter in Azerbaijan were mercilessly killed. The fate of more than 2,000 Khodzhaly residents is unknown. The killing, torturing, and [word indistinct] of people is aimed at achieving a national goal. Terrorism and hatred for the Azerbaijani people have become state policy in Armenia, from which more than 200,000 Azerbaijanis were forcibly evicted in 1988 and 1989. More than 30 towns in the Karabakh mountains have recently been set on fire and destroyed and more than 24,000 people have become refugees on their own land. All this is [word indistinct], the objective of which is to forcibly wrest a part of Azerbaijan's territory.

The aggressors' ferocious behavior knows no bounds. The Armenian armed forces have broadened their wide-ranging military operations along Azerbaijan's border. In response, the fully empowered state organ of the Azerbaijan Republic, a member of the United Nations, the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet National Council appeals to foreign parliaments to strongly condemn the ferocious Armenian aggressors who have plotted against Azerbaijan's territorial integrity and (?massacred) the Azerbaijanis in the Karabakh mountains.

The world must realize that the Armenian leaders and their supporters have plotted against the Azerbaijani people's right to live on their own land.

The Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet National Council hopes foreign parliaments will consider this and move to support Azerbaijan.

The council adopted the appeal when it convened on 3 March.

[Signed] Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Chairwoman El'mira Kafarova

Statement Issued on Khodzhaly Operation

NC0303183392 Yerevan Radio Yerevan Network in Armenian 1730 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Text] The press center of the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic [NKR] Supreme Soviet has circulated a statement detailing the operation the self-defense forces carried out against Khodzhaly on 26 February to silence the gun emplacements there.

The self-defense forces seized two Grad launchers, two armored cars, one 100-mm cannon, an Alazan missile launcher, and large amounts of ammunition.

Thirty-four Armenian women and children who were being held hostage in Khodzhaly were taken out of the village by the Azerbaijanis and there has been no word of them. The Armenian side handed over 200 residents, including 40 Meskhetian Turks, who had remained in Khodzhaly, to the Azerbaijani side unconditionally.

The NKR Supreme Soviet chairman ordered that a commission be set up to search for the missing.

Armenian Helicopters Said Flying Arms to Region

LD0303190492 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1818 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Excerpt] Baku, 3 Mar (TASS)—[passage omitted] According to Sakhib Akperov, head of the executive power of Azerbaijan's Kelbadzhar Rayon, weapons, armored equipment, artillery, and other military equipment is being flown uninterruptedly into the mountainous area of Nagorno-Karabakh. This freight is being supplied from Armenia to Stepanakert by transport helicopters, which are making 10-15 flights daily.

Arms Shipments Unconfirmed

LD0303175692 Moscow TASS in English 1703 GMT 3 Mar 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lev Volnukhin]

[Text] Bonn March 3 TASS—The German Government has not confirmed information that arms from the former East German Army granted to Turkey under the acting German-Turkish agreement on military assistance are allegedly being shipped to Azerbaijan, according to the German Government's response to the inquiry of the Democratic Socialism Party's parliamentary group.

The response was circulated here today by the German Parliament's Press Service.

The German Government's statement proceeds from Turkey's obligation under the above-mentioned document not to transfer the granted arms and property to third countries without the agreement of the German side.

It also proceeds from the statement of the Turkish general headquarters that all the delivered arms from the East German Army stocks are at the disposal of the Turkish Armed Forces.

Extraordinary Supreme Soviet Meeting Scheduled

NC0403101592 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 0430 GMT 4 Mar 92

[From the "Morning Information Program" by Khanlar Bayramov and Viktor O. Nazirly]

[Excerpt] The Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet National Council convened on 3 March. El'mira Kafarova, chairwoman of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet, addressed the meeting. A one-minute silence was observed to remember the victims of the tragic incidents in Khodzhaly. People's Deputy Rakhmi Gaziyev proposed holding an extraordinary Supreme Soviet session to examine the situation in the republic. The date of 5 March was agreed. [passage omitted]

Situation in Rayons, Armenian Attacks Reported

NC0403100792 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 0430 GMT 4 Mar 92

[From the "Morning Information Program" by Khanlar Bayramov and Viktor O. Nazirly]

[Excerpt] According to a report from Gorenboyskiy Rayon, the situation there remains tense. The towns of Sefer and Dide are being fired on from the direction of

Kuruchinar and Monat. Yesterday the town of Kapkara Koyunly was subjected to intense fire, while the enemy attacked Todan from the direction of the Armenian-inhabited towns of Kutluk, Manashid, and Erkech. The towns' defenders are trying to give the enemy a lesson they deserve.

The situation in Terterskiy Rayon is also tense, with fire coming from Beynagan, which is inhabited by Armenians. Several people have been wounded and many buildings destroyed.

The Internal Affairs Departments in the Tauzskiy and Kedabekskiy Rayons informed us that Tauzskiy has been peaceful in the past few days but bandits have been seen assembling in Armenia. The Armenians fired on the [word indistinct] towns in Kedabekskiy for an extended period on 1 and 2 March, wounding two citizens. [passage omitted]

Agdam 'Remains Tense'; Crimes Reported

NC0403095392 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 0430 GMT 4 Mar 92

[From the "Morning Information Program" presented by Khanlar Bayramov and Viktor O. Nazirly]

[Excerpt] We have focused our attention on Agdam, where most of the dead and wounded in the tragic incidents in Khodzhaly are being transferred. We contacted Mamed-zade, deputy head of the [words indistinct], last night and he described the situation in Agdam as tense. Our kinsmen who were evicted from their home towns in Nagorno-Karabakh under Khodzhaly jurisdiction have sought refuge in Agdam. The transfer of the dead and wounded in the recent incidents continues. Thousands evacuated from their home towns are being temporarily accommodated in Agdam and an effort is being made to help them. Although Agdam is experiencing a difficult time, there must be an attempt to establish a center in the city to unite all the forces in Nagorno-Karabakh. There must be no other opportunity for similar tragic incidents. The situation was relatively calm on 2 March but Agdam remains tense. New evidence has emerged in connection with Armenian bandit crimes in Khodzhaly, which foreign journalists have witnessed and recorded. Another 20 of our kin, most of them women and children, who were taken hostage by the Armenians, have been brought back to Agdam. The enemy treated them mercilessly. The Armenians are still holding some of our folk hostage. Steps are being taken to have them released. [passage omitted]

Appeal Sent to Yeltsin on Khodzhaly 'Massacre'

NC0303192892 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 1800 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Appeal to Russian President Boris Yeltsin from the Presidium of the Collegium of Representatives of the Republic of Azerbaijan; date not given]

[Text] Acting together with units of the Armenian National Army, the military units under Russian jurisdiction committed a bloody crime against the peaceful Azerbaijani people on 28 February. These savage elements have massacred Azerbaijani citizens. We have indisputable evidence confirming this. Khodzhaly, in the mountainous area in Karabakh, became the target of this act of savagery. The unprecedented crime that has been committed must be assessed from the legal and political viewpoints. No law allows the massacre of peaceful people, even during wide-ranging military operations.

The planned genocide of the Azerbaijani people, with the participation of high-ranking officers of the Russian Armed Forces, is continuing.

Mr. President, history has proven that it is impossible to suppress a people's struggle for national freedom this way. We are convinced that these butchers will be punished in the way they deserve. We also believe they must account for their inhuman behavior.

[Signed] The Presidium of the Collegium of Representatives of the Republic of Azerbaijan

Organizations Protest Armenian 'Terrorism'

NC0303190292 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 1800 GMT 2 Mar 92

[Text of statement by Azerbaijani organizations protesting acts of terrorism; date not given]

[Text] We say no to terrorism.

February marked the end of the fourth year of the planned political and later military adventure aimed at occupying Azerbaijani territory for the sake of realizing the ambition of creating greater Armenia. More than 200,000 Azerbaijanis were expelled at gunpoint from Gugark, (Makit), Yerevan, Kirovakan, Dilizhan, Megri, and (Teran) Rayons in Armenia after the tragic incidents in Askeran and Kafan. Later, the Armenian terrorists selected Nagorno-Karabakh as their target. Azerbaijanis were expelled from Khankendy and nearby towns. The people became refugees on their own land. A new phase began in the existing tension.

Well-armed Armenian bandits moved to commit an act of genocide against the Azerbaijani people, without any mercy for women, children, or the elderly. Thirty Azerbaijani towns were set ablaze and Khodzhaly was razed to the ground. All this has taken place in Azerbaijan. Not a single Azerbaijani has committed an act of terrorism in Armenia.

The progressive world has condemned acts of terrorism as criminal activity. Regrettably, however, it has been influenced by the [word indistinct] of the Armenian propaganda machine. As such, it has failed to see the bloody terrorist activities of the Armenians in Azerbaijan.

We call on the progressive world and all conscientious people to say no to acts of terrorism. God bless the souls of all the victims of terrorism. God bless the souls of all those who have been killed, including Azerbaijanis, Russians, Meskhetian Turks, [word indistinct], Kyrgyz, Georgians, Latvians, and [word indistinct].

[Signed] Rabiya Babayeva and Khanum Kanumova, on behalf of the Azerbaijan Society for the Defense of Women's Rights, which is named after Dilara Aliyeva; Academician Imam Mustafayev, on behalf of the Azerbaijan Council of the Elderly; Aliyev, on behalf of the Azerbaijan Lawyers' Association; Mamed-zade, on behalf of the Azerbaijan Teachers' Association; Anar, on behalf of the Azerbaijan Writers' Union; Zekov, on behalf of the [word indistinct] Voluntary Society; Ferdiyeva, on behalf of [words inditsinct]; Suleymanov, on behalf of the Dagestan Cultural Center; Eserbanov, on behalf of the Azerbaijan Society for Reformation; Ali Rizayev and Kasum-zade, on behalf of the Azerbaijan Union of Democratic Forces; Mekhtiyev, on behalf of the Azerbaijan Helsinki Accords Group; Mutalibov, on behalf of the Azerbaijan Citizens' Society; and Suleymanov, on behalf of the Democratic Union of Azerbaijani Intellectuals.

Commander of Military in Nagorno-Karabakh Named

LD0303195792 Moscow POSTFACTUM in English 1636 GMT 3 Mar 92

[From the "Politics" section]

[Text] Commander of Azerbaijan armed formations in the territory of Nagorno-Karabakh zone was appointed on March 2. There has been no such a post in Azerbaijan previously.

In keeping with the order issued by Ayaz Mutalibov, commander-in-chief of the Azerbaijan Armed Forces, Major-General Dadash Rzayev, first deputy defense minister of Azerbaijan became commander of Azerbaijan armed formations in Nagorno-Karabakh. Rzayev is also in charge of defense of populated localities in Nagorno-Karabakh.

PF [POSTFACTUM] learned at Azerbaijan Defense Ministry press-center that the commander was appointed to coordinate actions between all Azerbaijan armed formations in Nagorno-Karabakh.

Bid for President's Resignation Prompts Rally

OW0203183592 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1329 GMT 2 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In response to a call from the Popular Front [PF] of Azerbaijan, thousands of people in the cities of Oguz, Sheki, Fizuli and Gabala rallied at the end of last week to demand that President Ayaz Mutalibov resign and submit power to the National Council of the republican Supreme Soviet.

The PF wants Mutalibov and other senior officials to resign in connection with the Azeri army's defeats in Nagorno-Karabakh.

The Azeri Popular Front has appealed to parliaments and people the world over to stop genocidal practices against Azeris in Nagorno-Karabakh. The appeal, dated March 1, says that during the previous week the Armenians, with support from the Russian armed forces, killed over 3,000 Azeris.

Georgia

Gamsakhurdia Supporters Picket, Stage 'Pogrom'

LD0403062892 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0430 GMT 4 Mar 92

[Text] According to a report received by INTERFAX at the press center of Georgia's military council yesterday, the situation in the town of Tsalendzhikha became more acute. Supporters of Zviad Gamsakhurdia are picketing the town's enterprises. A group of unidentified young individuals staged a pogrom at the town's market. According to a report from that same agency, the arrival of Eduard Shevardnadze is expected in Georgia in the very near future.

Council Official Confers With Shevardnadze

OW0303194092 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1843 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In an interview with journalists Tuesday [3 March] Dzhaba Ioseliani, member of the Georgian Military Council and leader of the military organization "Mkhedrioni" ("The Horsemen") said that he had a telephone conversation with Eduard Shevardnadze. According to Ioseliani, the ex-Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR will visit his native land in March "and the details of how Shevardnadze can help the Republic will be discussed".

Ioseliani said he doubts that Shevardnadze would head the temporary Georgian government since the present cabinet "must see things through to the end", that is, until a new parliament is elected. The parliament will then decide who will head the government.

No Clashes in South Ossetia in Past 24 Hours

LD0303155892 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1440 GMT 3 Mar 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Valeriy Shanayev]

[Text] Vladikavkaz, 3 Mar (TASS)—The past 24 hours have been relatively calm in South Ossetia. According to the press center of the information committee, no armed clashes between the warring sides have been recorded, even in the most crisis-prone areas of the region. There are no reports of casualties.

Local observers attribute this encouraging development in the socio-political situation in South Ossetia to the real steps being taken by the leadership of South and North Ossetia and the provisional government of Georgia to remove the tension between Ossetia and Georgia. This was confirmed by a meeting near Vladikavkaz of representatives of the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic and Georgia. The meeting discussed halting the fighting in the region, removing the economic and transport blockade around Tskhinvali, and providing guarantees to enable the 100,000 refugees to return to their homes.

Sources close to the South Ossetian Republic's Supreme Soviet indicate that Tskhinvali welcomes the results of the meeting in North Ossetia and that it is ready for a constructive dialogue on certain conditions and with the participation of Russia's representatives. Tbilisi's reaction to the possibility of talks between the Ossetian side and plenipotentiary representatives of the Georgian provisional government in Vladikavkaz in the very near future is, so far, not known.

In the meantime, the situation in Tskhinvali remains tense in the extreme, and the blockade continues. The Georgian side is in complete control of all the roads used to send humanitarian aid there from Vladikavkaz. Residential areas have no supplies of electricity, gas, or water. The bakery is not operating, because of a shortage of flour. Many injured and sick people needing urgent attention are in the hospital, but all surgical operations have been canceled because of the shortage of medicines and equipment.

According to the North Ossetian Interior Ministry, several large motor vehicles, carrying food and medicines for the South Ossetian population, managed to make their way along the Transcaucasian highway, accompanied by all-terrain vehicles and tractors. The weathermen's warning of possible avalanches, due to the thaw, made it necessary to bring in helicopters to get the foodstuffs to Tskhinvali.

Highlanders Demand Solution

LD0403121492 Moscow TASS in English 1119 GMT 4 Mar 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Valeriy Shanayev]

[Text] Vladikavkaz March 4 TASS—The Confederation of Caucasian Highlanders plans to join in session in the coming days to discuss the developments in the region and to normalise Ossetian-Georgian relations, TASS learned on Wednesday [4 March] from Stanislav Kesayev, a North Ossetian people's deputy and an organiser of the session. An appeal is expected to be adopted at the session calling on the Georgian provisional government to cease military activities in South Ossetia, to unblock Tskhinval and promote the return of 100,000 Ossetian refugees back home, he added.

Sporadic shootings were registered in the outskirts of Tskhinval on Wednesday night, while the city itself and the strongholds of interior troops were shelled from the nearby Georgian settlements. A number of wounded among civilians and the military was reported, according to the South Ossetian Interior Ministry.

However, Deputy South Ossetian Prime Minister Feliks Zaseyev believes the situation has begun to normalise of late thanks to mutual steps undertaken by the South and North Ossetian leaderships and the Georgian provisional government. At a recent meeting near Vladikavkaz the sides discussed ways of settling the conflict, of a ceasefire and joint police raids to fight the wave of crime.

Despite the optimism of the South Ossetian premier, Tskhinval remains blockaded. Industrial and construction enterprises in the city will soon "celebrate" two years since they shut down because of a lack of energy and raw materials supplies. Road and rail transport is not functioning either.

South Ossetia needs urgent help, Zaseyev believes. Russia decided to send to the republic additional supplies of food and medicines, but they cannot reach Tskhinval as the transcaucasian highway is blocked by avalanches, he said.

Russian Commander Discusses Security Role

AU0403095692 Tbilisi SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA in Georgian 27 Feb 92 p 1

[Interview with Colonel V. Korchagin, commander of the military unit of Russian internal troops in Tskhinvali, by SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA correspondent Guram Vashakidze; place and date not given: "Where Is the Limit to the Patience of the Russian Authorities and the Georgians?"]

[Excerpt] **Information recently appeared in the Vladikavkaz press stating that "the first regiment of a Russian legion of volunteers made up of workers from a whole range of industrial enterprises in the Russian Federation has arrived in the capital of the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic. In the next few days, it is travelling to South Ossetia. The volunteers do not intend to take part in armed activities on the republic's territory. Their sole task is to protect Russia's southern borders."**

In connection with this, the editor's office is receiving questions and phone calls from readers wishing to know who these legionnaires are who are planning to come to Tskhinvali "in order to protect Russia's southern borders." (?!)

In order to answer these questions, a SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA correspondent met and talked with

Colonel V. Korchagin, commander of the military unit of Russian internal troops, formerly USSR troops, in Tskhinvali.

[Korchagin] The first of these volunteers currently number 11 persons. They have already appeared in Tskhinvali. The local authorities brought them by helicopter from Vladikavkaz.

We have met and talked with them. It is true that the legionnaires are workers and employees from different Russian towns—St. Petersburg, Tver, and Nizhni Novgorod. They belong to the Russian National Republican Party (the party's chairman is someone called N. Lisenko and its press organ is RUSSKOYE SLOVO). They wear bracelets bearing the inscription "RNL" ("Russian National Legion").

According to the colonel, nothing has been heard about the National Republicans and this party's program and political aims because there are now so many parties, organizations, and unions in Russia.

[Vashakidze] **Do you think that the presence of the volunteers in Tskhinvali will facilitate or hinder stabilization in this region and the start of peace talks on contentious issues and their successful continuation?**

[Korchagin] First, before answering this question, I would like to state the following (so that the paper's readers both in Tbilisi and Tskhinvali know this): Neither I nor my subordinates are politicians and we are not interfering in any kind of political affairs. We are here on the instructions of the Russian Government and the commander of the internal troops and we are subordinated only to the Russian Government.

Now, as regards your question concerning the presence of the legionnaires in Tskhinvali: They have no weapons. However, their presence there, naturally, cannot facilitate the process of stabilization. At present, I have no reason to be unfriendly toward them but if I discover that they are initiating any kind of hostile designs against the population of the Georgian villages, I will immediately drive them out!

[Vashakidze] **You said that the legionnaires have no weapons. In that case, how are these unarmed people with their bare hands "to protect Russia's southern borders?"**

[Korchagin] I don't know. I have not invited them to help us. Our military unit is coping well with its own business. If we receive the order, we will leave this place tomorrow. For the moment we are here and are carrying out the commander's orders.

[Vashakidze] **What are these orders?**

[Korchagin] To prevent the Georgians and Ossetians—the opposing sides—from drawing one another into a war. [passage omitted]

Accusations Against Gamsakhurdia Detailed

AU0303161992 Tbilisi DRONI in Georgian 22 Feb 92 p 2

[Article by Mikheil Abaishvili including interview with Georgian Procurator General Vakhtang Razmadze by an undidentified reporter; place and date not given: "A Step Forward"]

[Excerpts] **On 18 February a news conference given by Vakhtang Razmadze, Republic of Georgia procurator general, was held in the Assembly Hall of the "Samshoblo" Publishing House. It was devoted to the extremely tense criminal situation in Georgia.**

The procurator general stated in his own speech that the criminal world had started to become more active along with the arrival in power of national forces. Over two years there has been a catastrophic increase in the number of crimes. From the very start, disgraced persons have attached themselves to the national movement in order to avoid prosecution for committing criminal acts. Almost every party is forming illegal armed formations. As a result, a large amount of weapons has been gathered among the population. The combat-inefficient militia is not only unable to uncover crimes but also is incapable of estimating their number. It has lost the support of society.

Naturally, this speech gave rise to quite a number of questions. Here are a few of them:

[Reporter] **Batoni [Georgian polite form of address] Vakhtang, what sums of money from the banks and the budget were misappropriated by the Gamsakhurdia government?**

[Razmadze] Forty million rubles were taken illegally from the republic's budget. No documents of any kind exist to show why this sum was taken, by whom it was taken, and on what it was spent. In addition, over 4 billion rubles were given to various cooperatives, organizations, and joint enterprises that were instructed to import different types of goods and products into Georgia. However, not one of these instructions has been implemented. Furthermore, the interest has not been paid. There are many such facts. The financial situation was put into total disarray.

[Question] **What accusations are being levelled against Zviad Gamsakhurdia, the former president of the Republic of Georgia?**

[Razmadze] First, that he was involved in the misappropriation of state property; second, that Zviad Gamsakhurdia laid the basis for the struggle between the Georgian and Ossetian peoples in Georgia. Reliable evidence is being gathered about this. As many as 250 Georgians and over 300 Ossetians have died in this struggle. The third accusation against the former president is that, during hostilities between the government and the opposition, hostages were taken by Gamsakhurdia's forces on the territory adjoining the government building, and they were tortured using methods reminiscent of the Middle Ages. For this purpose, Gamsakhurdia created a special police force and placed at its head the former trade minister. We have established the identity of almost all the executioners. They include several former Supreme Council deputies. In total, 45 persons. The Procuracy has already issued warrants for their arrest. [passage omitted]

Shevardnadze Supported, CIS Opposed in Poll

AU0403101892 Tbilisi DRONI in Georgian 22 Feb 92 p 2

[Text] On 17-18 February 1992 the sociological center's "Psychological Service" conducted a regular telephone opinion poll among Tbilisi's population, the results of which are as follows:

1. That Georgia should become a member of the CIS was supported by 16.2 percent of the respondents; 47.6 percent were opposed to this; 12.4 percent found it difficult to answer this question.

2. That Batoni [Georgian polite form of address] Eduard Shevardnadze should occupy an important post in the Georgian Government was supported by 41.9 percent of the respondents; 21 percent opposed this; 13.3 percent refrained from stating their opinion.

3. Restoration of the Georgian Constitution of 1921 was supported by 50.5 percent of the respondents; 4.7 percent opposed it; 21 percent stated that that they did not recognize this constitution and, therefore, found it difficult to answer this question. At the same time, it should be pointed out that a large number of those respondents who supported the restoration of the 1921 Constitution stated that changes have to be introduced into it.

It is significant that 23.8 percent of those polled refused to be interviewed in spite of the fact that the poll was anonymous. This can perhaps be explained by the "critical" nature of the questions.

[Signed] "The Psychological Service"

Successor to Throne Suffers Heart Attack

OW0403124592 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1053 GMT 4 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Konstantin Bagrationi, the successor to the Georgian throne, who arrived in Tbilisi together with his family a few days ago, has been taken to hospital with a cardiac deficiency, IF's [INTERFAX] correspondent was told at Georgia's health ministry.

Trade Minister Thanks Russia for Food Aid

OW0103173992 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1544 GMT 1 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The government of Moscow has sent 140 tons of sugar to Georgia. Georgia's Trade Minister Shota Sharashenidze said, while receiving the humanitarian aid in Tbilisi, that "this gesture of friendship will be repaid a hundredfold in the future". He added that this unselfish action by Moscow inspires all the more respect because the Muscovites find nowadays themselves in dire straits.

Justice Official on Registration of Parties

AU2702184492 Tbilisi SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA in Georgian 14 Feb 92 p 4

[Interview with Manana Bokuchava, deputy head of the Republic of Georgia Ministry of Justice Department for Citizens' Social Organizations and Legal Information by SAKINFORM correspondent Irina Jorbenadze; place and date not given: "The Law is the Law"]

[Text] **The registration of political parties and organizations is taking place in the republic. Manana Bokuchava, deputy head of the Republic of Georgia Ministry of Justice Department for Citizens' Social Organizations and Legal Information, spoke on this subject to a SAKINFORM correspondent.**

[Bokuchava] Since 14 January, the day marking the start of registration, we have registered six parties. They are: The Georgian Popular Front, the Social Democratic and Democratic parties, the Union of Crop Farmers, the National Justice [erovnul-samartlebrivi] Party, and the Party for National Unity and Social Equality. Six sets of rules of different political parties and organizations have also been submitted to us for examination.

[Jorbenadze] **We have received conflicting information from different sources on the number of political parties and organizations in the republic, ranging from 40 to 80. What can you tell us on this subject?**

[Bokuchava] It is difficult for me to give a precise figure as new associations are being formed that are calling themselves parties. They must register with the Ministry of Justice if they want to have the status of a juridical person. As far as we are concerned, we are not delaying and are not artificially hindering any registration. On the contrary, we are assisting in the drawing up of the rules and are improving them together with the members of one party or another.

[Jorbenadze] **Has there been a case of a party's registration having been rejected and, if so, what was the reason?**

[Bokuchava] As yet, none have been rejected. However, this could happen if a party's rules do not correspond to the requirements of the Law on Political Associations of Citizens. I will remind you that prior to registration, a party has to be legalized, that is to say, it has to have its rules published in one of the newspapers.

[Jorbenadze] **What about the Communist Party?**

[Bokuchava] According to the law, a party that is prohibited or whose activities have been halted can be legalized only one year after sanctions have been applied against it. It must then submit an application for registration to the Ministry of Justice. Therefore, the question regarding the Communist Party cannot be resolved earlier than August of this year. The law is the law.

[Jorbenadze] **Does the "Stalin" Society exist today?**

[Bokuchava] As a political party, no. They call themselves a social organization. It is in such a form that they have submitted an application for registration.

[Jorbenadze] **If the Ministry of Justice rejects the registration of a party or social organization, to whom can it complain?**

[Bokuchava] The Supreme Court. It should resolve the matter.

[Jorbenadze] **Does control over parties and social organizations form a part of your functions?**

[Bokuchava] Of course. For example, if a party breaks its own rules or commits an illegal act and we have documentary proof of this, we have the right to bring the discredited party before the Procuracy or the Supreme Court.

Latvia

Supreme Council Adopts Privatization Program

LD0303161192 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 1400 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Text] An hour ago the long-awaited resolution on the proposed privatization of state and local government property and the preparatory program for it was adopted by the Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia. It stipulates that the resolving of all the state's and local authorities conceptual questions must start immediately, without delay, and this process must move forward. The Civil Law of the Republic of Latvia is also to be immediately restored.

Furthermore, the Supreme Council sets out the forms for the privatization of state and local government property. First, (?prior to the introduction of the new currency) property can only be sold at auction for freely convertible foreign currency. In addition, it states that property may be transferred also into shares (?for statutory) companies, with each enterprise being appointed a possible portion, even for example those who are working at these enterprises already, guaranteeing, however, that privilege [words indistinct] cases.

Section Two provides that, until the adoption of the law on the restoration of property rights and the payment of compensation, only projects finished after 17 June 1940 can be privatized, as well as those which belonged to the Latvian state as of 17 June 1940. This version of the second paragraph was proposed by the Constitution faction, and was also supported.

The Council of Ministers will be charged with presenting a list of sites of state property by 30 March, which will determine those sites not to be privatized, those to be privatized next year, as well as those to be auctioned specifically to foreign private persons and private firms only for freely convertible currency. At the moment the Supreme Council is embarking on examination of a bill relating to the commissions on privatization of state and local government property, and the arrangements for their formation. The law is receiving its first reading.

Medicine, Communication Prices Increase

LD0303181292 Riga Radio Riga International in Latvian 2030 GMT 2 Mar 92

[Text] Many economic offices and enterprises chose 1 March as the date for notable price increases on many types of products. Beginning on 1 March, the price of medicine tripled. The decision was made primarily due to increased manufacturing costs. The price increase will support hospitals and public pharmacies. Pharmacies and medical manufacturers said prices of Latvian medicine have been cheaper than in other regions. This led to the purchase and illegal export of medicines to other regions.

Beginning on 1 March, cigarette prices increased by three to four times. The Riga Tobacco Factory set the new prices because of increased costs of raw materials. Cigarettes, too, in Latvia have been cheaper than in neighboring states. This inevitably led to their export, say industry representatives.

Beginning on 1 March, the government also increased prices on alcoholic drinks. Now a one-half liter bottle of 40-proof spirits may cost up to 150 rubles, which is about twice the previous price.

The money accrued will be mainly used to finance the social sphere, says an administrative representative of the government.

Communications charges in Latvia also increased on 1 March. An ordinary letter within the borders of Latvia will cost 1 ruble, twice as much as before. Telephone calls will become considerably more expensive. Each telephone subscriber now must pay 40 rubles a month. Installation costs 1,000 rubles, while one minute of conversation within Latvia costs 1 ruble.

First Installments to European Bank Made

OW0103180292 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1517 GMT 1 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Latvia has remitted $350,000 to the European Bank of Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), the press service of the Latvian finance ministry told BF [BALTFAX]. This is the first installment for 300 EBRD shares which the Latvian government is to purchase to become a full member of the bank.

Former Party Officials Restricted From Posts

LD2902235892 Riga Radio Riga International in English 2130 GMT 28 Feb 92

[Text] The Supreme Council of Latvia has prepared a draft law temporarily restricting former Communist Party officials and KGB employees to hold high posts in the Republic of Latvia.

The bill provides for banning former staff employees of the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union and Latvia except technical staff, former members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, former Komsomol secretaries, former staff employees of the Soviet intelligence services, KGB staff and non-employees [as heard], members of the CPSU and the Communist Party of Latvia after 4th May 1990, and members of the banned pro-communist organisations such as the Interfront [word indistinct] Salvation committees etc, as well as persons found guilty of executing totalitarian policy from occupying posts in the Latvian civil and military service.

The bill stipulates that these persons may not be people's deputies, judges, [word indistinct], employees of state administrative bodies, members of emergency volunteer groups, customs, police and state security services.

These persons are also banned from holding posts in municipal bodies, state enterprises, press, radio, television, information agencies and educational institutions according to this draft law.

Persons already occupying or applying for one of these posts should fill out a special form stating that the above restrictions do not apply to this person in question according to the bill.

If the parliament enacts the bill, the restrictions will apply to a number of deputies of the Supreme Council. The Parliament's Chairman, Anatoliys Gorbunovs, the Supreme Council secretary, Imants Daudiss, Chairman of the Parliamentary Commission for the Economy Ojars Kehris, Chairman of the Democratic Party of Labor former KGB Major (?Juil Borja) and other (?said) deputy chairmen of the Parliamentary Faction [word indistinct] (?Rolands Rikards). The author of the bill, MP [member of parliament] Peteris Lazda said the draft law might provide for certain exceptions to persons who had done outstanding service to the Republic of Latvia, but admitted that a special commission absolving sin would not be set up as there is no organization in Latvia enjoying the nation's confidence that could create such a commission.

Redeployment, Social Options for Troops Cited

PM0303144692 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Mar 92 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by Irina Litvinova: "We Won't Leave the Garrison, Officers in Latvia Say"]

[Text] Riga—The military unit at Telsiai received a directive from the General Staff: Prepare for redeployment to Leningrad District. An operations group went to the site of their future station—the city of Gryazovets in Vologda Oblast. There are barracks for the soldiers. But there is no trace of any housing for officers, warrant officers, and their families. And nowhere to house equipment and arms.

A resolution of the officers' assembly was sent to Yeltsin and Shaposhnikov in Moscow: Until proper social and living conditions are ensured at the new place of deployment, the unit will not leave its garrison.

This is only one illustration offered to journalists at a news conference convened urgently by the council of officers' assemblies of the Northwest Group of Forces.

In resolutions, appeals, and open letters the military write: We will not go to an empty field. They cite Shaposhnikov's statement at the all-Army Conference. And once again, they warn: Any redeployment order without guaranteed social provision will be assessed as criminal.

You can dispute the Russian officers' approach, but this is the reality that has to be reckoned with in the context of the withdrawal of troops from Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Thousands of officers feel cornered, and the failure to resolve many problems is making their position increasingly strained.

People in Latvia are accustomed to unilateral actions. These are continuing even after the communique signed by intergovernmental delegations on the withdrawal of troops. For instance, according to this document, a mechanism for payment for the lease of premises and land is to be formulated and food rates set. But the authorities in, for instance, Ventspils decided to hurry the military: They presented them with accounts amounting to many millions for the lease of land, and demanded construction materials and gasoline in exchange for food. They threatened the recalcitrant unit commanders: We will switch off your water and electricity. The military men act in different ways. Some have agreed to this kind of "barter," but the tankmen dug an artesian well on the unit territory and started a field bakery. The authorities' actions were assessed as blackmail and the breaking of accords reached at talks.

Instances of the forcible seizure of movable and immovable army property have become increasingly frequent in the Baltic countries. "Basically, such incidents are an encroachment on the state interests of the Russian Federation and on the honor and dignity of servicemen under its jurisdiction, and provoke the army to use force in retaliation, which could lead ultimately to unpredictable consequences," the officers' statement says.

The military men explained that the personnel on guard are trained and instructed to act in strict accordance with the requirements of regulations and laws, up to and including the actual use of weapons. This position was confirmed by Colonel General Valeriy Mironov, commander of the Northwestern Group of Forces, in a recent interview.

Another problem is the discharge to the reserve of military men without apartments. Those who are apparently provided with housing have also found themselves in a difficult position. Apartments built by the Defense Ministry were declared by the Baltic countries to be official apartments and not to belong to the military. You are discharged, but you have nowhere to go. But that is not all. In Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia a military man is a man without rights: They will not give you a passport, a job, a residence permit. Officers in the Baltic countries have appealed to Russian President Boris Yeltsin to intervene.

There is just one demand to the military department: Do not discharge us from the army until housing has been made available at the chosen place of residence.

Experts from the Russian and Latvian sides are to commence work in Moscow 3 March, discussing in detail the problems associated with the troop withdrawal and preparing for the next meeting of intergovernmental delegations.

Recognition for Victims of Nazism Urged

LD0303162692 Riga Radio Riga International in Latvian 2030 GMT 2 Mar 92

[Text] Latvia has asked to be included on the list of states where resident Jews suffered under the Nazi occupation. Anatolijs Gorbunovs, chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia, has sent an official letter to German President Richard von Weizsaecker and Bundestag Chairwoman Rita Suessmuth requesting inclusion on the list.

The letter states that during the war years more than 80,000 resident Jews were annihilated, as well as tens of thousands of other Jews who were deported here from other states. Even now there are living in Latvia about 100 Jews who experienced the occupation and the Nazi camps, having been saved from death by some other means. The letter was sent at the official request of the chairman of the Latvian association of former ghetto inmates. After the inclusion of Latvia on this list of countries, and the presentation of the necessary documents, persons who suffered could receive a single payment amounting to DM 5,000.

Investigation Begins in Missing Grain Supplies

LD0303153492 Riga Radio Riga International in Latvian 2030 GMT 2 Mar 92

[Text] An investigation has begun into the disappearance of grain on the railways. The Procuracy of the Republic of Latvia is to begin an investigation into the disappearance of large amounts of [word indistinct] grain on Latvian railways. The grain was stolen from freight cars transporting it from Riga's ports to parts of the republic. As the investigation has noted, several tonnes of maize making up U.S. aid supplies have vanished from the cars.

The investigators do not yet wish to rule out deliberate sabotage either.

Lithuania

Butkevicius, Mironov Discusses Withdrawal

LD0203205792 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1500 GMT 2 Mar 92

[Excerpt] Today, Colonel General Valeriy Mironov, Northwestern Army Group chief, arrived in Vilnius. He held a meeting with Minister of Defense Audrius Butkevicius to discuss the withdrawal of the former Soviet Army from Lithuanian territory, which since the middle of January has been under the Russian Federation's jurisdiction.

The visit by the colonel general is primarily connected with the withdrawal of the military unit stationed in Mickunai. Over the course of three, 24-hour periods, most frequently during the night, the rocket division, along with all its equipment, has been transferred to the Vilnius suburb of Visoriai.

Ministry representatives and experts have inspected the ecological, sanitary, and epidemiological conditions, as well as the buildings and engineering facilities of the area vacated by the transferred unit in Mickunai. All the inspectors assert that throughout the 24 hectares of territory the soil has been greatly damaged and many trees have been cut down. Such facts have been recorded in the Act of Inspection.

Moreover, the military unit that had been in Mickunai and which has been transferred to Visoriai is expected to be withdrawn to Russian territory at 1000 tomorrow. The column, along with rockets and other military equipment, escorted by officials of our defense department and some police officials, will travel through Utena and Zarasai to the Latvian Border, where escort will be assumed by appropriate Latvian services.

The Lithuanian Defense Ministry has also received a list of units intended to be withdrawn from Lithuanian territory during March. However, the 107th Vilnius Division does not appear on this list. [passage omitted]

First Unit Exits Visoriai

LD0303140692 Moscow TASS in English 1243 GMT 3 Mar 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Kazys Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius March 3 TASS—A column of 37 armoured vehicles left the gates of a military settlement not far from the Lithuanian capital at 10:40 local time today, as former Soviet Armed Forces began withdrawing from Lithuania.

The withdrawal of the unit, stationed in Mickunai village, should have begun on February 25, but was postponed and the hardware and troops were moved to Vilnius, according to the command of the Northwestern Group of Forces.

Today, troops stationed in Visoriai, a suburb of Vilnius, paid their respect to the unit's banner. The ceremony was attended by Northwestern Group of Forces Commander Colonel General Valeriy Mironov, in charge of the Army withdrawal from the Baltic states.

The unit is the first to leave Lithuania and the schedule for further withdrawals and completion date will be agreed at interstate talks, Mironov told reporters.

Although the military unit is expected to cross the Lithuanian-Latvian border later today, the military settlement in Mickunai is still controlled by the military.

"The question about movable and immovable property must be resolved at interstate talks," Mironov said. The

Lithuanian Government, nevertheless, has declared immovable property of the Soviet Army property of the republic.

Authorities Refuse Recognition

OW0303175692 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1348 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A Soviet air defense division previously stationed in Mickunai (Lithuania) started to withdraw March 3 at 10:00 from the town of Visoriai near Vilnius: first 35 military equipment items and 100 servicemen were pulled out.

However, the Lithuanian authorities refuse to recognize the withdrawal until the Soviet military command does not transfer the military station in Mickunai to the Lithuanian side. Lithuanian Home Defense Minister Audrius Butkevicius said this in an interview with BF [BALTFAX] after meeting with Commander of the Northwestern group of forces Valery Mironov who had arrived in Vilnius to attend the division's withdrawal.

Butkevicius said that so far the two sides had not resolved property problems.

In the meantime, Mironov told reporters that the military command had been prepared to start the withdrawal already on February 25, as it was indicated in his telegram to Butkevicius. However, Mironov argued, the Lithuanian side said that first a joint commission on taking control of the military station should start working.

Speaking about prospects for the withdrawal of troops from the Baltics, Mironov said that it would take at least 5 years. He added that the air defense division is heading for the Leningrad Military District. According to Mironov, the withdrawal of forces from Latvia will begin in March.

***

The independent newspaper RESPUBLIKA reports that several more units of the Northwestern group of forces, currently under the purview of the Russian Federation, are scheduled soon to pull out of Lithuania.

March is the preliminary date for the withdrawal of an armored regiment from the second largest city of Lithuania, Kaunas. The act on inspection of the regiment's station was signed February 28.

The newspaper says an engineering battalion stationed in Smilgiai near Siauliai is to start the withdrawal March 25. The servicemen of the battalion are specialized in construction and repair of military aerodromes.

National Defense Faces 'Sufficient Problems'

LD2902200592 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Extcerpts] Today, Audrius Butkevicius, the minister of national defense, met with representatives of some public organizations. Here is a report:

A seminar entitled "The Conception of the Defense of the Country and the Formation of the Lithuanian Army" was held today in the hall of the Confederation of Free Trade Unions. It was organized by the Union of the Lithuanian Social Democratic Women. [passage omitted]

Audrius Butkevicius, the minister of national defense, addressed the partcipants and replied to their questions. He described in detail the concept of national defense. It emerged that it exists and the minister described it point by point. The budget allocates 1.2 billion rubles for national defense. This constitutes six percent of the total budget. At first sight this seems to be a large sum, but in reality if to purchase weapons at market prices, only each second soldier in the army would be armed with an automatic weapon. There would be no money left to purchase either tanks, planes, or helicopters.

Briefly, sufficient problems are facing the country's defense.

Envoy to Russia Denies Claim to Kaliningrad

PM0303115292 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Mar 92 Morning Edition p 4

[Sergey Guk report incorporating interview with Egidius Bickauskas, Lithuanian charge d'affaires in Moscow; date of interview not given: "Lithuania Does Not Officially Lay Claim to Kaliningrad. Unofficially, the Lithuanian Ambassador to the United States Talks About Incorporation in Future"]

[Text] "One day, maybe not tomorrow, nor the day after, it (Kaliningrad) could become part of Lithuania, could be in Lithuanian hands."

This statement was made by no ordinary citizen, but by S. Lozoraitis, Lithuanian ambassador to the United States, in an interview published in the conservative newspaper LIETUVOS AIDAS, a publication which, REUTER asserts, reflects the views of President V. Landsbergis.

By what means Kaliningrad and its oblast, together with its population, are to become a Lithuanian possession is not specified in the interview. But the grounds for Vilnius' territorial claims are given. Since medieval times, present-day Kaliningrad has been part of Lithuania several times.

According to Lozoraitis, a threat hangs over Kaliningrad Oblast: The Germans want to extend their influence to the region. And Russia is trying to create a separate republic of its own there, which would be a "tragedy for Lithuania" comparable to the creation of the Danzig corridor on the eve of World War II. The solution: "What we must do urgently is to guarantee that the Berlin-Moscow axis does not acquire concrete shape." Ambassador Lozoraitis even speaks of a German-Russian threat, calling on the West to rally against it.

The question is very simple: Are Lithuanian politicians really intending—albeit "not tomorrow, nor the day after"—to annex Kaliningrad? If not, why this war of nerves? There is enough tension in relations between the former republics of the USSR without that.

We sought clarification from Egidius Bickauskas, Lithuanian charge d'affaires in Moscow. Here is his statement, which, in accordance with Mr. Bickauskas' wish, the editorial office is reproducing verbatim:

"I am not sure whether Mr. Lozoraitis' opinion is fully and accurately reflected in the newspaper. I have not discussed the matter with him. But if so, then this is only the personal opinion of one politician, who, incidentally, was not talking about any immediate prospect, but simply reflecting on possible historical trends and the influence of various states on this Russian oblast and, naturally, on Lithuania's attitude in this connection.

"In reality, without interfering in Russia's internal affairs, we cannot simply look on with indifference to the future destiny of Kaliningrad Oblast, which is linked with Lithuania historically and where many Lithuanians live. We wish Kaliningrad prosperity and we want the closest friendly relations with that oblast, as with Russia as a whole. But Lithuania has never intended and does not now intend to talk about any territorial claims."

[Guk] So neither the country's president, nor the government, nor the parliament shares that view?

[Bickauskas] In any event, expressions such as those used by Mr. Lozoraitis... no official opinion on this... no opinion sharing his position exists.

[Guk] He is indeed ambassador to the United States, as REUTER reports?

[Bickauskas] Yes, Lithuanian ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary. I would like to point out that he said this while in Lithuania, and not as Lithuania's representative anywhere.

[Guk] As the Americans or the Germans say, "a policeman is always on duty." The same is true of an ambassador, wherever he may be.

[Bickauskas] Maybe.

Ambassador's Position Not 'Official'

OW0303180792 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1348 GMT 3 Mar 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Press secretary of the Lithuanian parliament Audrius Azubalis said at a news briefing in Vilnius March: "We do not want the Kaliningrad region to belong only to us". He noted that Lithuania would like to take part in deciding the fate of the region on equal terms with Russia, Poland and Germany.

Azubalis pointed out that the Kaliningrad region has an extended border with Lithuania and Poland, that is why its future concerns both Lithuania and Poland, "though we do not seek a unilateral solution to this problem".

Addressing a statement of the Lithuanian ambassador to the USA Stasis Lozoraitis, Azubalis noted that it reflects his personal opinion and has nothing to do with the official position of the embassy.

As BF [BALTFAX] reported earlier, Lozoraitis told the government newspaper "Lietuvos Aidas" that the Kaliningrad region (currently, part of Russia) should belong to Lithuania. Head of the Russian Foreign Ministry Information Board Vitaliy Churkin called the statement "provocative" and stressed that Moscow is waiting for explanations from Lithuania.

Azubalis also stated that official Vilnius had always favored demilitarization of the Kaliningrad region. In the situation when Soviet military units arrived in Kaliningrad from Germany, it is impossible to talk about demilitarization and independence of the region, as well as about foreign investment into its economy, Azubalis said.

Eastern Lithuanian Community Founded

LD0203110592 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 29 Feb 92

[Text] The constituent congress of a new public movement—the Eastern Lithuanian Community—was held in Vilnius today. We talked with Vytautas Raudejunas, a founding member of this organization.

[Begin Raudejunas recording] The aim of this group is to unite all public movements of the region in order to improve economic standards, share culture, and regenerate spirituality in the region. We all understand that this region has been neglected to some extent in the past. It has also been noticed lately that it has been to some extent isolating itself even more. Therefore, this must not be delayed, and an attempt was made to form a public institution that would help solve this matter. [passage omitted]

Apart from public organizations, the congress was attended by representatives—and this is very important—of minorities. It was attended by a Belarussian organization, by some Polish organizations, by Tatars—by everyone residing here. In all, representatives of 35 organizations were present. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Questioning of Former OMON Official Allowed

*OW2902191492 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1517 GMT 29 Feb 92*

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Lithuanian newspaper RESPUBLIKA reports that last week the Latvian law-enforcement bodies allowed Lithuanian investigators to question former deputy-commander of the Riga OMON [special purpose militia detachment], Sergey Parfyonov, who is kept in a Riga preliminary investigation ward. The Lithuanian representatives wanted to know whether the Riga and Vilnius OMON were involved in the attack on the Lithuanian customs post of Medinikai bordering on Belarus (July 1991). During the attack, 5 Lithuanian customs officers and policemen were killed.

Senior investigator of the Investigation Department Algimantas Astaska told the RESPUBLIKA that Sergey Parfyonov had been persuaded to testify in the presence of his lawyer. Algimantas Astaska said that Sergey Parfyonov had admitted the fact of handing 70 7.62 bullets, used for silent shooting, to commander of the Vilnius OMON Boleslav Makutynovich. Sergey Parfyonov also said that he had no information pointing to the Riga OMON's involvement in the Medinikai operation, because he was on leave at that time.

U.S. Grain Shipment Arrives in Klaipeda

*LD2902201192 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network
in Lithuanian 0600 GMT 27 Feb 92*

[Summary] Correspondent Romas Jankauskas reported that at 0300 another ship from the United States carrying more than 35,000 tonnes of fodder grain arrived at Klaipeda port. This was the second batch of U.S. humanitarian aid to Lithuania. Ten days ago the first shipload of fodder grain arrived on board Pride of Texas from the United States. It took a week for the Klaipeda stevedores to unload 33,000 tones of fodder grain and to transport the fodder grain to 12 combined fodder enterprises of the republic. Last Sunday [23 February] the ship left to return to the United States.